

A2480

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 24

ticular issue. It would, in effect, reflect American opinion.

The delegates to the Congress could be elected by districts of, say, 5 million persons, with universal suffrage. This would, of course, give the larger nationalities heavy representation; however, such must be the case if the people of the Americas are to be represented. In any case, the OAS Council would continue to represent nations.

A multinational OAS military force should be created to handle acts of aggression in the Americas; and the concept of an Inter-American Common Market should be discussed.

Almost 140 years have passed since the first proposals for Pan-American unity were made. It is time that something was done to make the dream of American unity a reality, for there may not be much time left.

JACK D. FORBES.

NORTHridge, CALIF., February 8, 1963.

The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising: A Commemoration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Hitler's invasion of Poland was the signal for a Second World War, it was the signal for treachery and deceit, it was the beginning of the collapse of the Balkan countries before Hitler's might; it was also the beginning of something far more. It was the beginning of the mass extermination of an entire race of people, for the Jews of Poland were to be erased by methods even now almost impossible to comprehend.

When the victorious Germans first marched into Warsaw in the fall of 1939, the wheels were already beginning to turn in the plan to take care of the Jewish problem, although very few realized what was in store. First there were the restrictions: Jews were forbidden to work for the government, to work in key industries, to bake bread, to earn more than a certain amount of money, to buy or sell from any outsider, to use public transportation, to possess gold or jewelry, and each had to wear a distinctive armband. How could any man be asked to do these things? If such were to happen to us we would fight back. But no, we have our homes, children, our past lives and all that we own and hold dear to think of. Maybe we must accept, because is it not more important to survive?

Next came the ghetto. All Jews had to move to a certain part of town, to be walled in so as not to contaminate others with their Jewishness. They could only leave their walled area by pass, to work in the factories supporting the German war effort. Surely now is the time to stop permitting ourselves to be so pushed around, but wait—we are still together, we are still a family, and we can move all of our possessions to the new area. Living may be more crowded,

freedom even more restricted, but we are still alive.

Some found a chance to escape the ugly city life by going off on a work gang, into the countryside. The Germans needed men to help in the war plants. At least that is what they said when, first by asking for volunteers, then by force, they took whole families into their "work camps." They would suddenly arrive at a given section in the ghetto, call all inhabitants out of the buildings, and, if necessary, drag them off to the distribution center for shipment to the countryside. Families were broken up, children torn from mothers' arms, all property left behind was taken by the state to cover the Jewish debt. Yet still, in the ghetto, organized resistance to what was happening could not be started. Still the people clung to what they had left, hoping that quotas for the work gangs would soon be filled, that they would be left alone, even if isolated from the rest of the city. After all, there was a shortage of factory workers within the city, so those who were working for the Germans or their Polish supporters felt safe in their position.

Then rumors began to circulate. Those families that were sent off to the work camps in the countryside—nothing was ever heard from them again. Spies were sent out to follow the trains of misery, to learn what was happening, to confirm or deny some stories that were so incredible few dared repeat them. The spies went out, they saw, they returned. The work camps, they were death camps. The potential workers—their only work was to strip off their clothes and be marched into the huge communal showers, to be washed with poison gas, to be slaughtered by the tens of thousands, to have their bones cremated, to literally disappear without a trace. This was Hitler's answer to the Jewish problem.

Back in the Ghetto of Warsaw the stories began to circulate with more authority. As the awful truth dawned some were stunned into apathy, but others, many others, in the agony of their reality, broke down the resistance to concerted action—if death was all that awaited them, then they would not meet it voluntarily, they would fight.

The Nazi occupation authorities, and their henchmen, finally decided in reply to the insistent demands of Himmler and Eichmann in Berlin to get on with the job, that the remaining Jews in the ghetto were to be marched out to the distribution centers, to be prepared for shipment to the countryside, to annihilation. Word of this intent was received in the ghetto. Time had come to resist.

It was Passover. It was the time when Jews the world over remember the lot of their people in Egypt under the Pharaohs, when God sent down his plagues upon the Egyptians, when all the first born of the country suffered death, only the Jews remaining untouched. It was the time of year when one remembered Moses leading his people as the Red Sea parted, and they beheld before them freedom in the land of their ancestors. But this was the evening of April 18,

1943, the Jewish ghetto quarter of Warsaw. There was no Moses to lead these people to freedom, only their dedication and courage could give them honor. There was hope at least for a brief quiet time to celebrate the occasion with prayer and the breaking of unleavened bread. Not even this small hope was answered. The word spread quickly, the Germans were coming, they were marching to the walls. It was time to prepare a greeting for them.

And what a greeting it was. Hand grenades, gunfire, liquid fire, fists, and stones. The SS men were taken unawares, they fell back, leaving many dead in their wake. It was long in coming and they had suffered through unspeakable indignities, but the time had arrived—the people of the Ghetto were in revolt.

Nazi armies returned, and were driven back again. Ammunition of the ghetto fighters was running low, they were driven underground into bunkers, or hideouts in attics of buildings, yet the fight went on. During the day they hid out in cramped quarters without water and with little food. At night the streets were theirs, and they used the time to strengthen their positions.

Then disaster struck. The Germans set fire to the entire area, burning the fighters from their attic cover; all supplies were cut off, there was no water, no food, the women and children had to remain underground all the time. Some, men and women, with spirits broken, marched out to the Germans to surrender, the others held out. They held out against constant attack from the ground and air, against hunger and thirst, against fear of death yet fear of not dying before the Nazis got a hold of them. On May 8 the Germans launched a concentrated attack on the central bunker containing the headquarters operation. All 200 defenders, including the core of the leadership, were killed or committed suicide to avoid capture. Still, some held out to the end of May, a small group of heroic men and women. They held out even longer than did Poland herself against the German invaders. Finally, after almost the entire ghetto area had been flattened, with only 8 buildings still standing, resistance was broken. Of the 40,000 Jews in the ghetto at the beginning of the fighting only a few hundred were left to filter out, some through the gas-filled sewers, to continue fighting in the forests.

The revolution had been broken, but the spirit and heroism of the participants, the faith which made them withstand such torture, these are not forgotten. The State of Israel today, and the fact of its existence, stands as a living and dynamic monument to the heroic Jews of the Warsaw ghetto, who laid down their lives for life—for future life in freedom from persecution of their people.

On this 20th anniversary of the heroic uprising of the Jews in the Warsaw ghetto against their Nazi persecutors, let us remember with awe their heroism, let us not forget what they were fighting against, let us honor with our prayers

1963

REDUCING SEISMIC SIGNALS

Mr. Wadsworth haplessly based his criticism on the Disarmament Agency's weird contortion of these facts which culminated in its erroneous assertion that the "big hole" in Soviet test cheating depends for its existence on carrying out clandestine activities in U.S.S.R. alluvial soil. Actually the "big hole" exists, as explained below, because of the size to which seismic signals from significant cheat tests can be reduced irrespective of geology, not (unfortunately for Mr. Wadsworth, who staked part of his prestige on it) upon testing in scarce Soviet alluvium.

The indisputable facts which establish the existence of the "big hole," brought to light during the Joint Committee's hearings, were:

Disarmament Agency witnesses testified that both current Anglo-U.S. proposals, and new ones soon to be announced, will rely on seismic observatories outside the Soviet Union to discover underground cheat testing inside its borders. Only a token number of unreliable delayed-reporting, tamper-prone unmanned and, as yet uninvented, "black box" devices will be demanded for placement in Russia.

The Defense Department's top seismologist, Dr. Carl Romney, testified that the capability of seismographs to record intelligible data is physically limited by natural earth background noise which occurs everywhere. Its effect on seismographs is similar to static on a shortwave radio: unless a seismic signal is larger and stronger than background noise, it is simply unintelligible.

Seismic signals double the background noise level are needed to "detect" seismic disturbances, whether they be created by man or by nature. Signals 10 to 20 times the background noise level must be recorded to be able to "distinguish" unnatural seismic events in the U.S.S.R. from earthquakes.

Recording signals big enough to make this distinction are the key to arousing the suspicion of monitors and of setting a treaty's on-site inspection machinery into motion. Here the "big hole" comes in.

SIMILARITY TO EARTHQUAKES

It exists because Soviet scientists can keep the seismic signals from secret test so small in size by the time they emerge from Soviet borders that even though they are detected, they cannot be distinguished from hundreds of similar sized small earthquakes occurring annually in the U.S.S.R. This can be done by holding yields down below three kilotons and testing in formations like alluvium which transmit seismic waves poorly; testing in underground cavities which decouple explosive shock from surrounding earth and drastically reduce the seismic signal, or a combination of the foregoing.

This eliminates the key to arousing suspicion and dispatching on-site inspectors. While the United States stopped all its testing, in effect it would simply be trusting a Soviet promise not to test by these undiscoversable means.

The Atomic Energy Commission Director of Military Applications, Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, U.S. Army, testified that the entire spectrum of nuclear weapons of military interest, except very large yield super H-bombs which the Soviets already have anyway, can be perfected by tests carried out under these conditions of undiscoverability. General Betts revealed that even without a need for secrecy approximately one-half of U.S. underground tests in Nevada are carried on precisely at these very low, undiscoverable yields.

These are the facts not faced by the above-mentioned writers. They must be faced if nuclear test-ban negotiations are to be carried on with the realism American citizens demand of their Government.

Even the most ardent test-ban proponent should join in vigorously demanding closure

of the "big hole" by installation of manned seismic observatories inside the U.S.S.R. Only an effective treaty which inhibits nuclear progress to the same degree on both sides of the Iron Curtain has any chance of reducing the risks of today's nuclear war. A "big hole" treaty would stop our nuclear progress and create the new risk of surreptitious Soviet testing to gain the surprise military superiority needed to back up a surrender-or-die ultimatum.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, April 15, 1963.

What Freedom Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Thomas J. Rice, a 17-year-old junior at Regis High School, Eau Claire, Wis., was recently chosen as Wisconsin's winner of the 16th annual Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I am very proud that a Ninth District student won the statewide contest and wish to call his essay, "What Freedom Means to Me," to the attention of my colleagues:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

"We the people of the United States of America. . . . Think of the ideals that put freedom into that pronoun 'we.' These two common letters supply the lifeblood, people, behind the thought of freedom, personality, and courage. For truly, without men, freedom is a dream; and without personality and courage, men are helpless.

To any man—to us—personality means the individualism of freedom; for we each have our very own. We want to enjoy it and be proud of it. We want it to be as great as a personality can be. It means a life to us—to any man.

For freedom is the developing of a personality—the personality that gives men a mountain and the longing to climb it, gives them a challenge and the desire to conquer it, gives them a star and the wish to reach it. Pity the man without a star; his personality is incomplete. He's like a magnet in a cage. He has no freedom. Iron ideals are attracted to him, and he likes their strong points, but he can never quite touch them. He likes the ability of his friends, the nails, to hold rising ideas together, to unify hopes, and to make them firm. But he can't quite touch them. He can't pick up their sharper points and use them to give himself a broader, well-rounded personality. He likes the ideas his typewriter key friends have expressed; but he can't communicate with the keys. He's locked in. His personality is depressed; he loses friends; he has no ideas to cherish—all through loss of freedom. For being able to develop a personality is freedom.

But a growing personality is just the privilege of freedom; courage is its duty. Freedom without courage is complacency. Without courage, we are content at the bottom of the mountain. The challenge will be unconquered, and freedom will be lost. For freedom gives us the privilege of a personality, and the personality must have courage or the privilege will be lost.

It takes courage to be one of 6,000

privileged men crucified along the Appian Way, knowing that your wife and children will be sold in Rome's slave market for less than the price of a horse. Yet you are happy. You were born a slave, and under Spartacus you tasted freedom for 4 years. You feasted on the thought of Richard Lovelace: "Stone walls do not a prison make, nor iron bars a cage." You knew well that when the courage of freedom is defeated, there is no battle to win, no challenge to conquer.

But to most of us, courage won't mean death; but rather, a way of life—a life to pound nails day after day; to check accounts day after day; to drive a truck day after day. But still, a life to be lived in its fullest; a life that we must not live half-heartedly; a life guided by the words of the Reverend Bob Richards: "It's not where you are that counts, but in which direction you are going." And we know that we are going toward a star, helped along by courage.

We only hope that courage will never be defeated. If our personalities give us the words, we want to be able to say them. It means a life to us. It means freedom.

Yes, think of the men, the blood, the ideas, the hopes and prayers that put meaning behind the Hungarian freedom fighters—put meaning into the "we" who "hold these truths to be self-evident."

Cuba: Some Suggestions for Multilateral Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the continuing discussion and debate concerning our Cuban policy, I wish to submit for consideration some constructive proposals for multilateral action which have been made by a professor at San Fernando Valley State College. This letter was printed in the western edition of the New York Times on February 28, 1963:

TO STRENGTHEN OAS—SUGGESTIONS OFFERED TO INCREASE INTER-AMERICAN UNITY

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Cuban situation, the tension evident between Canada and the United States, and the widespread anti-Yankee feeling south of the Rio Grande all point, in this writer's view, to a great need: the strengthening of the Inter-American Community. There has been a great deal of discussion in regard to the North Atlantic Alliance, but very little mention of the fact that, after all, the United States and Canada are a part of the Americas.

I would like to propose that the Organization of American States be strengthened in the following manner:

Canada should be invited to membership along with the other American members of the Commonwealth;

An Inter-American Congress, representing the people of the Americas, should be organized. This body would help to cement the feeling of community by providing a common meeting place for delegates who would not be attached to a particular nation's diplomatic corps. It could be empowered to make advisory declarations on matters of concern to the Americas as a whole, and it could, perhaps, be granted the power to enforce the OAS Council to consider a par-

all my heart that we can count on you, Mr. SHORT, to fight Federal aid to education all the way. It would bring about so many, many injustices—and what it would do to education itself. From what I have heard and read, I honestly believe that we can count on you, Congressman SHORT, to protect and defend our rights, in your name—in the name of our parents—and in the name of us—the teenagers.

Yours truly,

DIANNE BICKLER.

The Joke Is on the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the Montgomery, Ala., Advertiser of April 20, 1963.

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, Apr. 20, 1963]

THE JOKE IS ON THE UNITED STATES

Anderson, Mo., may become the most famous small town in America, if only for a few days, because it has petitioned the United Nations for the kind of help that is routinely dispensed to such improbable places as Senegal.

Anderson Mayor Bill Hall has solemnly informed the U.N. that the town needs a natural gas plant and \$337,500 from the U.N. to get started on it. The usual agency for such requests, the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, informed Anderson that no domestic help was available. Whereupon Anderson's Congressman, Representative DURWARD HALL, sicced Mayor Hall (no kin) on the U.N.

Congressman HALL, who admittedly is no passionate admirer of the U.N., reminded Anderson that U.N. technical assistance is available in generous doses to almost any country that calls itself backward and to such members of the Communist bloc as Bulgaria, Albania, Cuba, Yugoslavia, and Poland.

Congressman HALL was impressed by the fact that the United States is the most faithful dues-paying member in the U.N. But whereas the United States got nothing back for its contribution to U.N. technical assistance programs, the Communist contributors came out with more than they put in.

So Anderson, Mo., is asking for about half what Senegal got for a mineral survey program and about a third what Cuba got for an agriculture station.

You are probably not wrong to sense a large element of horseplay in Anderson's petition, but the jest is not without meaning. Americans are reminded of the great lengths to which the United States has gone in an effort to keep the U.N. on its feet, even when so much is invested and so little withdrawn. The reference is not merely to money.

Anderson's practical joke—very practical, in fact—is well-aimed. Americans support the U.N. but they don't have to idolize it. They don't have to applaud when the United States clamps airtight sanctions on Cuba with one hand and, through the U.N., forks over money to Cuba with the other hand. Or when American dollars go to build the technology of a Communist country at the same time that many small American towns are gasping for want of local industry.

If it is to be largely supported by the United States, the U.N. is properly subject to the constant, scalding auditing that is

directed at any other Government-supported agency.

The ones who give a pain in the neck are the fanatics who get a goofy look in their eyes and denounce any slight criticism of the U.N. as rank apostasy.

The Role of Business Confidence in Our Nation's Economic Behavior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a factor which administration officials, businessmen and economists often overlook or insufficiently emphasize in discussing the problems of our economy is the role of business confidence.

According to a recent column by M. J. Rossant in the New York Times, business confidence is a positive factor that must be considered in any economic analysis. In his opinion, last year's steel price dispute "was a blow to confidence and had a definite, if immeasurable, impact on business activity." The quarterly survey of manufacturers by the National Industrial Conference Board supported this conclusion by noting that during 1962, capital appropriations were increased "in every quarter but the second, the period embracing both the steel dispute and market break."

Mr. Rossant pointed out that consumer spending proved to be a vital support in the anxious days last summer when a recession was feared, but consumers themselves would have been easier with their money if businessmen had demonstrated more faith in the economy. He concluded:

It seems unwise to underestimate the power of confidence in a market economy.

In my opinion, Mr. Rossant offers a sound analysis of the confidence factor in any study of economic behavior, and I ask unanimous consent that his column from the April 15 New York Times be included in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1963]
CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE: A VIEW OF THE SPIRITS OF BUSINESSMEN AND HOW THEY MAY AFFECT THE ECONOMY

(By M. J. Rossant)

President Kennedy and the steel manufacturers, those battle-scarred veterans of last year's bitter dispute, are demonstrating an understandable reluctance to reopen the conflict. With an awareness stemming from experience, both sides appear anxious to avoid any new blows to business confidence, which has been undergoing a strong revival since its deterioration a year ago.

Last year's crisis of confidence was never healed through a formal truce. In fact, the President and Roger M. Blough, chairman of United States Steel, have continued to defend their actions. Regardless of the merits of each case, however, their dispute was a blow to confidence and had a definite, if immeasurable, impact on business activity.

The intangible factor of confidence has been of great interest to economists. Most

agree that the expectations of businessmen and consumers influence the business cycle, but just how much has been a matter of dispute. Those who downgrade its importance note that we have never talked ourselves into a recession or out of one.

MOOD FLUCTUATIONS

This is true, but changes in mood can have a considerable economic effect, giving added momentum to an upsurge or acting as a depressant in a decline.

The late John Maynard Keynes, who is the patron saint of many of the administration's economists, stated that confidence, or what he called the animal spirits of businessmen, can have an impact on business activity.

According to Keynes, "If animal spirits are dimmed and the spontaneous impulse (to invest) falters, leaving us to depend on nothing but mathematical expectation, enterprise will fade and die—though fears of a loss may have a basis no more reasonable than profits had before."

The chilling of spirits is probably greatest when there is an abrupt change caused by some unexpected event. This seemed to be the case last year.

Just last week, before Wheeling Steel announced its selective price increases, Mr. Blough implied that the administration's successful effort in blocking the across-the-board advances in 1962 had weakened the economy and slowed growth.

Economists who give weight to the confidence factor tend to support Mr. Blough's position that the steel imbroglio and the market break that followed made the advance slower than it might have been.

One significant piece of supporting evidence is the survey of manufacturers' capital appropriations made each quarter by the National Industrial Conference Board. In 1962, these appropriations were increased in every quarter but the second, the period embracing both the steel dispute and the market break. Quite obviously then these events had a dampening, if temporary, effect on the spirits of businessmen.

If the second quarter reversal in confidence had not taken place, the rise in business activity might well have been spritely rather than sluggish last year. Fortunately, the economy has enough basic strength to withstand this caution when businessmen convinced themselves that the administration was intent on altering the delicate power relationship that existed between government, management, and labor; but it was a pretty close call.

CONSUMER STRENGTH

Consumer spending proved a powerful support in the anxious days last summer, when fears of a recession were growing. Despite the magnitude of the market decline, which meant heavy losses—at least on paper—for many investors, the strength of consumer demand helped to restore business confidence.

Consumers, too, however, might have been easier with their spending if businessmen had behaved less cautiously. Again, no one will ever know, but it seems unwise to underestimate the power of confidence in a market economy.

Confidence, it should be noted, has little to do with political preferences. Most businessmen are Republican partisans, yet the most serious deterioration in confidence took place under Herbert Hoover, a stalwart member of the business fraternity, and there were several jolts to confidence under the President Eisenhower administration.

Wherever businessmen congregate these days, there are jokes about the Kennedys, griping over the new expense-account rules and complaints about tax reforms. This, however, is a return to normalcy. There is no open hostility and no sign that they want to dig up the past.

This show of healthy animal spirits, which is apparent in the stock market, rising capi-

April 24

A2466

tal appropriations and in surveys of consumer intentions, can give added momentum to the economy, already in good shape. There may be some disappointment if tax cuts are not voted this year. But it is doubtful that failure to act on taxes will have much of an impact on either confidence or business activity in the short run. The real test will come in 1964 when animal spirits and the economy may both need a lift.

Heading Nowhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, our foreign policy is heading nowhere. When President Kennedy first assumed office, it was understood that he had no experience; but he has been in charge for 2 years, now, and it would seem that some kind of foreign policy ought to be proposed. It is no wonder that frustration is in full swing.

In the April 16 issue of the Wall Street Journal, William Henry Chamberlin discusses this frustration and in today's New York Herald Tribune, David Lawrence points out the contradictions in our Laos and Cuban policies.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 16, 1963]
FRUSTRATION FORMULA: ADMINISTRATION MIXES TIMIDITY ON CUBA, UNREALISM ON ATOM TEST BAN, WEST BERLIN
(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The word frustration frequently appears in dispatches from Washington at the present time.

The Kennedy administration probably reached the height of its prestige in foreign affairs when it faced down Nikita Khrushchev on the issue of withdrawing the missiles which had been stealthily installed in Cuba.

Since that time, however, much has gone wrong, from the standpoint of American foreign policy. General de Gaulle, by vetoing British admission to the European Economic Community and insisting on his national nuclear deterrent, tossed a monkey wrench into administration plans for closer Western defense and trade coordination. Soviet troops have remained in Cuba, emphasizing a clear breach of the Monroe Doctrine. The fragile agreement for the neutralization of Laos is beginning to fray around the edges.

Some of these disappointments are due to factors beyond the control or anticipation of the administration. But on three issues, at least, the United States has been pursuing policies based on questionable premises and therefore inviting failure and frustration.

First, there is the attempt to reach an agreement banning nuclear tests at almost any price. This might be justified if it could be assumed (a) that the Soviet Union would observe any such agreement and (b) that the spread of nuclear weapons to other powers would thereby be stopped. On any coolheaded survey of the situation, in the light of past experience, both these assumptions seem most improbable.

BROKEN TREATIES

It would be superfluous to recite the long list of Soviet broken treaties and agreements. One need only recall the unpoliced moratorium on nuclear testing which began in Octo-

ber 1958, and dragged on until the end of August 1961, when it was unilaterally denounced by the Soviet Government, although Khrushchev had solemnly affirmed earlier that the Soviet Union would never be the first to resume nuclear testing. It is difficult to estimate how much the United States lost by denying itself the advantages of research while the Soviet Union, at the very least, was preparing for new tests.

Nor is there any reason to believe that an American-Soviet agreement would stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Is there any reason to believe General de Gaulle would cease and desist from his development of French nuclear power merely because an American-Soviet agreement had been signed? Would Red China, visibly on the outs with Khrushchev, heed a request from him to stop its nuclear development?

Second, there is an obvious disadvantage about the talks on West Berlin which have just been resumed. There could be no objection to raising, as a serious potential threat to peace, the unnatural partition of Germany. But a discussion limited to West Berlin places the United States before the awkward alternative of making unilateral concessions or refusing any change in the present situation.

THWARTING ANTI-CASTRO CUBANS

Third, some aspects of our policy, or lack of policy, toward Cuba since the withdrawal of the Soviet missiles are timid, self-contradictory and calculated to raise the question whether our diplomatic victory in Cuba last October was as complete as it seemed.

We have all but renounced any intention to use our forces in an invasion of Cuba. No one in his senses would like to see a repetition of the Bay of Pigs fiasco. Both as Senator and as President, Mr. Kennedy has expressed the hope that the Cuban people will rise to vindicate their freedom. The implication would seem to be that the American Government, through properly covert channels, should extend all feasible aid to the anti-Castro Cubans.

By announcing a crackdown on the activities of such groups we are making our avowed objective look ridiculous and creating doubt as to the steadfastness of our will and purpose among our friends in countries threatened by Castroite propaganda and subversive activity. Successful guerrilla movements have always depended on support from without. The Algerian nationalist bands that eroded French rule in that country would, in all probability, never have succeeded if they had not received a steady supply of arms from across their frontiers.

It is unlikely that boycotts and other forms of economic pressure will bring down the Castro regime so long as all the resources of the Soviet bloc are mobilized to prop him up, and many of our NATO allies refuse to join in the boycott of Cuba. To give Castro the protection of our Armed Forces while proclaiming his downfall as our objective is a policy of sorry confusion.

Talks that lead nowhere and are unlikely to lead anywhere and policies that are self-contradictory furnish an excellent formula for frustration.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 24, 1963]

DICHOTOMY OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD CUBA AND LAOS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Most Americans can't pinpoint Laos on a world map. They know it's somewhere in southeast Asia. Yet they read in the newspapers that American marines are being rushed to the area, that American soldiers have been losing their lives next door in south Vietnam, and that the President of the United States is engaged in serious discussions which are indicative of a crisis with the Soviet Union about Laos.

In contrast, just 90 miles away is Cuba, where the Soviet Union has between 10,000 and 20,000 troops and technicians and the latest weapons of warfare, but the United States hesitates to invade Cuba, though it is apparently ready to threaten the use of military force in Laos.

It isn't explained just why it is an act of war to invade Cuba, but isn't an act of war to use troops in southeast Asia.

And it isn't clear to anybody just why international complications and the escalation from one stage in the crisis to another isn't feared with respect to Laos, but is given as the reason for American hesitation in Cuba.

The foreign policy of the United States today toward Russia is a mixture of strong words at times and long periods of inaction. The strange attitude with reference to Cuba because of a fear of offending the Soviet Union is, of course, explained in the hackneyed phrases of diplomacy. In the one case, it is argued that Thailand—next door to Laos—has invited American help, while, in the case of Cuba, it is pointed out that Castro has invited Soviet help.

But there is in both situations an anomaly. For the Government in Cuba doesn't represent the people, and in Laos the neutralist Government has been threatened from within by a Communist takeover, and it isn't clear just what any government in that area represents. There is an unwillingness in Washington, however, to recognize the Communists as the true enemies of the people in both Laos and Cuba.

Although, for instance, the United States has addressed several communications to Moscow about the missiles and the continued presence of Soviet troops in Cuba, there is no inclination to use force to clean up the situation there. With respect to Laos, however, the U.S. Navy is moving into the area with thousands of marines, and there is a definite threat to take military action. American officials state flatly that the Communists have broken the truce in Laos.

Meanwhile, the debate inside and outside of Congress continues as to whether invasion would mean a big war over Cuba. But for some reason there is little talk of a big war arising when the United States undertakes military steps to thwart Communist imperialism in Laos.

The Kennedy administration is well aware of the pressure of public opinion for a more determined policy with respect to Cuba. There is no doubt that public opinion outside the United States is manifesting an increasing disapproval of Washington's attitude of watchful waiting and indifference to Communist encroachment.

In the last few days, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, Democratic leader in the Senate, has come out in favor of an economic embargo against Cuba by all countries in this hemisphere. He wouldn't have made such a statement without the approval of the President. The plan undoubtedly is to mobilize sentiment behind the whole idea as the United States, through diplomatic channels, begins to urge the Latin-American countries to organize an economic boycott against Cuba under the auspices of the Organization of American States.

This, however, is a long and tedious process and looks like a temporary scheme to answer the criticism about a do-nothing policy. After several months it will become apparent that an economic embargo against Cuba is hardly effective. When and if, as Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, has urged, the United States faces up to the Communist threat everywhere and begins to consider a severance of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Government, then—and only then—will situations such as have arisen in Laos and in Cuba begin to be changed from defeat to victory for the free world.

April 24

The missiles do only the explosives delivery job. They have to be pretargeted and, once launched, cannot be recalled or redirected. They cannot follow a movable target. They cannot discriminate. They cannot assess damage, nor report battle conditions. They make for a rigid defense posture. While they necessarily carry the brunt of the strategic strike, total dependence upon them would not be consistent with our objective of controlling destruction and preserving always some foundation for ending the conflict.

Because of the variety of such requirements in our approach to strategic warfare, some type of manned system seems called for. The type of aircraft we've been calling strategic bombers are characterized by extreme range capabilities, very high ceiling, great load-carrying capacity, long endurance, multiman crews, and multijob possibilities. Our current studies are directed at determining the possible application of these flight characteristics at the point within the missions bracket between missiles on one side and high performance fighters on the other. The RS-70 is the most advanced of these concepts, but it is not by any means the only type of manned system of significant strategic potential.

We can not say now just where we will come out, but there doesn't seem to be any question as to the value of manned vehicles able to stay aloft for long periods, travel very great distances, fly high or fly low, and fly fast. There are many jobs to be done, reconnaissance-strike missions, observation or surveillance, command and control, or weapon launching.

We can get the flexibility of my second point with airpower. This is one reason why I have no taste for the salty beer that results from the crying into it by those who seem to write off manned systems because of the job changes I've mentioned.

But the main reason why I don't intend to join in drinking any tearsalted beer is that while we still have to do all the old jobs assigned to airpower, we have the difficult, demanding, challenging, and expanding new job to do in space.

Before I say anything about our future in space, let me establish two benchmarks. The first is that the Air Force needs everything it can get from NASA. NASA needs us, too, as the record of how NASA puts things into space indicates, but if there weren't a NASA, the same facility and capability would have to be created some other way.

There is reassuring precedent for the principle of having an outside-of-defense civilian agency provide the type of support we need. The case at point is the Atomic Energy Commission. Our own nuclear weapon flexibility as well as the Polaris-carrying submarine is sufficient testimony.

The clear lesson for us in the space field is that we must put requirements on NASA to meet whatever part of our needs can be met in this way. We must utilize every possible resource to build the necessary military capability, and I can assure you that NASA is ready to respond. Jim Webb, the NASA Administrator, harbors no illusions about NASA's responsibilities in support of national defense requirements.

The second benchmark is that there is no such thing as peaceful space or military space. There is just space. A new and massive space program in a civilian agency was launched nearly 5 years ago, with—for reasons which seemed not unreasonable at the time—a great hullabaloo about peaceful objectives.

The Nation is holding to those peaceful objectives, but we also know that the military services will have to do the same thing in space that they have always done in the media of the land, sea, and air. The Air Force forward space program is, therefore, aimed at two general objectives.

The first is to acquire the capability to utilize space in support of the military forces operating in the familiar environments of land, sea, and air. Space offers new aids. Observation, warning, communications, military geodesy, and meteorology are areas for the application of space technology to defense. All of the services have requirements of their own, and it is up to the Air Force to provide them the access they need for their purposes. The Secretary of Defense has assigned the responsibility to us.

Right here, let me caution against letting any interservice differences blur either judgment or vision. It is my position that competition in ideas among the three services is desirable. The imaginative, strongminded people we need in this business are going to have differences, and they must be resolved constructively.

Our second general objective is to acquire the necessary defense capability for the aerospace regions themselves. We must be able to protect the peaceful activities in space of the nations of the free world. We believe that space can be free to all for peaceful activity only if somebody keeps it free. We are that somebody. The job involves mastering the space environment in order to deny to a hostile power the uninhibited military exploitation of space. We can only do this if we have the ability to detect and counter any military threat. We believe that both manned and unmanned systems will be required, but we cannot say now in what relative investment.

We have a lot to learn. The recent agreement with NASA for joint participation in the Gemini program is one way. That agreement represents an answer from both DoD and NASA to critics who said there was no place in space for military man. Our own activity directed toward manned space vehicles will increase, and with NASA's backup we'll attain the needed capability earlier than we would otherwise.

A term you hear around Washington to denote the areas of cooperation between Government agencies is "interface." Such terms usually leave me pretty cold but this one does have some descriptive value.

There will be plenty of problems between the Air Force and NASA, but not by any means all at the "interface" points such as Cape Canaveral. Neither of us would be true to trust or tradition if there weren't. Any machine as big as the national space effort is bound to have some kind of friction. But just remember, a clutch is a friction interface. Its purpose is to join two shafts for the transmission of power.

The power we can get will provide protection for the free world in space. This was my third point—to make sure that no aggressor can exploit space, either for expansionism on earth or interference in space with the peaceful pursuits of the free world.

The people of the United States know they must have an Air Force second to none if they are to apply their strength constructively in peace. My fourth point covers just a few things, then, that the Air Force officer must believe, know, and practice.

Get these ideas straight:

The Air Force is at the highest state of readiness and response capability in all its history.

It is strengthening that posture almost monthly.

It needs better people than ever before. It has more opportunity for their professional growth and potential contribution to the Nation's defense than ever before.

It needs the old skills, but to a far greater degree, for AFCON and general purpose forces, for airlift and air defense, and for the new mission of heavy multiman crew, long endurance aircraft.

And then it needs that whole new range of skills, the skills and techniques which are being developed by the Slaytons, the Coopers,

the Grissoms—and all of their colleagues, civil and military—to enable America to keep her place as freedom's leader by strength and conviction.

The Air Force is an organization of professionals. It takes brains and hard work to keep up. The competition is tough, but the opportunities to serve your country and make a mark in the service to which you have dedicated your lives will continue to expand.

It all adds up to a reminder for those who wear the Air Force uniform that the wild blue yonder is still beyond.

A Plan Needed for Liberation of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the deterioration of our relations with the Cuban exiles and the apparent inability to cope with the Cuban situation stems from the apparent lack of any concrete plan by President Kennedy. In his usual manner of dealing with problems he confounds everyone by a series of conflicting statements emanating from the White House and through his brother, the Attorney General.

Since the Bay of Pigs disaster we have been told by the President, by his spokesmen, and by the Attorney General that we did promise air cover for the invasion, that we did not promise air cover, that we would support the freedom fighters in their struggle to liberate their homeland, that we would arrest any of them that tried it.

In a brave and heroic speech to the world a few days before the election last fall, the President demanded the removal from Cuba of Russian missiles and troops. The quarantine he called for turned out to be no quarantine nor blockade indeed. We never halted any ships and even allowed the first Russian vessel to proceed even though its cargo was oil, the most vital commodity necessary to the Castro economy. No on-site inspections were ever made to assure that the missiles had actually been removed. Months later we are still trying to get the Russian troops out of Cuba by appealing to Khrushchev to honor his pledges and accepting his word that they are being removed in spite of the fact that he has never been known to honor his word or any agreement.

At this point I would like to include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal pointing out the risks of the Kennedy inaction, and that the President must formulate and execute a plan of action to reimpose the Monroe Doctrine:

THE RISKS OF INACTION

President Kennedy is perfectly correct when he observes that it's pointless for people to just say we've got to "do something" about Cuba. And he is equally right in noting that a good deal has been done since October in terms of restricting trade and maintaining surveillance of the Communist island.

But these are not the issues which bother so many people. The causes of concern are

1963

the United Nations. It is gratifying to the committee that the interest of Wisconsin citizens in international affairs and the United Nations is greater than ever.

Secretary Zuckert's Challenge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the April 1963 issue of the Air Force Digest contains an inspiring and challenging address by Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert which he delivered last month to personnel at the Air Force Missile Test Center at Patrick Air Force Base, Fla.

In his remarks, Secretary Zuckert outlines the strategic role the modern Air Force must play in our Nation's overall defense posture, in our searching probes into the uncharted frontiers of space, and in our continuing campaign for victory in the cold war.

Secretary Zuckert's speech inspires our imagination. Threaded throughout his remarks is the position that the American Air Force must attain and maintain firm superiority in space and elsewhere and settle for nothing less in every challenge which confronts it.

I heartily recommend the reading of the remarks of this brilliant service Secretary and I wish to insert the text of his speech in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

CHALLENGE TO AMERICA BY THE HONORABLE
EUGENE M. ZUCKERT, SECRETARY OF THE AIR
FORCE

It was suggested that I discuss the future of the Air Force in space. As both starting point and finish line for everything I say, just keep in mind that the job of the Air Force is not space; it is defense. It is not research and development, not strategic, not tactical, nor any of these. It is the application of airpower or aerospace power to the defense of the United States and the free world.

Some of my remarks may be responsive to the suggestion about space, but it seems more important to me to talk about the future of the Air Force in the defense of the United States. The future is from now on, and now is cold war.

The cold war, reduced to essentials, is a confrontation of sovereign powers in which one side maintains a pressure of aggressive expansionism, forcing the other to maintain a defense against it. The most urgent requirement of that defense is to deter the aggressor from using military force to attain his ends. We are the defenders.

I would like to make four points about that defense.

First, we must have superiority at the top level of intensity of war, and must extend that deterrent superiority to lower levels in order to contain or limit war and aggression.

Second, we must have flexibility and control of the application of destructive power at each level.

Third, we must be prepared to protect ourselves against the extension of aggressive pressure into space, and

Fourth, the Air Force role in this overall defense requirement presents the greatest

challenge in the history of any military organization.

In this cold war confrontation, the technological and industrial capabilities of both sides are such that sooner or later, if not now, the unrestrained use of that power for nuclear destruction would make its employment in war a net losing proposition for both sides. The defender must have power to wreak unacceptable damage on the aggressor as a first requirement of his defense. This is where strategic deterrence starts.

But an aggressor whose political system may make expansion a necessity will, if deterred by fear of retaliation from using his full power, seek other opportunities. He will try to find the place to apply his power which he calculates will not provoke his own destruction. Close one avenue to him and he tries another. He can logically be expected to stay short of triggering his own destruction. The aggressor naturally has the initiative in this game so we must be able to apply whatever force is necessary to deny him his objective.

So far, we have been able to do so. The risk has been too great for him. We must keep it that way. We have our own reasons for desisting from war but until we can make him apply the same reasoning to his national behavior, we have no choice but to make sure—and make sure he knows—that war—any war he starts—means certain military defeat for him. We know, of course, that all-out war makes no sense for either side, nor for the rest of the world.

The defender, of course, has to maintain a force adequate to prevent ultimate defeat. This requirement may change, but the use of the force is his final effort. Two courses are then open. The defender can, as a matter of judgment, wait and weigh each application of the aggressor's power in order to or until he can decide it is sufficiently threatening to warrant the jugular response. As a second course, he can prepare to overcome the aggressor's military power before that point is reached. It seems to me that the first course is closed at the end. A sensible defense is to be ready to respond at a lower level with whatever force is deemed necessary to stop the aggressor—and at a net loss for his attempt.

The United States is leader of the free world, in President Kennedy's words, by both strength and conviction. Our conviction, both moral and military, is that we must be prepared to stop aggression at levels of intensity below the level of the maximum destruction.

Our basic strength, our power to deter aggression, our ability to defend ourselves must always be greatest at the top. In our strategic bomber and missile forces, we maintain power adequate to deter an enemy from striking for our jugular. Strategic forces, of course, have the capability of counterforce attack which does not constitute total devastation of a nation.

We have to maintain this superiority at the top, but we must also have it at levels of war more likely to be brought against us. That is why we are building deterrence down from the top level of intensity. The reason is simple. The only way we know of forcing an aggressor to keep down his use of military force is to make each level of intensity of conflict more certain of defeat for him than the one below it. He won't be deterred unless he knows that as his commitment goes up, his chances go down.

One hears talk about the danger and probability of escalation. The effect of my first point, extending the deterrent with superiority at each level, is to make escalation a penalty and not an opportunity for an aggressor.

At each level where we determine we want to stop aggression, we must be prepared to make the most efficient possible use of every resource available to us, skillfully employing

advancing technology to save human resources. It is imperative that, for the long haul, we hold the investment at each level to the absolute minimum necessary to maintain effective deterrent superiority. The cheapest way to stop war is at the lowest level of conflict with the quickest possible stop to aggression. To me, this means we use tactical nuclear weapons whenever we determine the military situation demands their use, whether by Army, Navy, Marines, or the Air Force.

If we would have the aggressor desist from any course of action which may be desirable to him but unacceptable to us, we must have him know that we will use whatever force it takes, nuclear or nonnuclear, to stop him. This kind of deterrence employs all services.

The President has made clear his determination to have more choices than no response or total response. This is the purpose of counterforce. This is the reason we must have flexibility in strategic forces. This is why the great increase in what has been called tactical forces, now designated in the budget as general purpose forces. One phase of the buildup is the combining of ground power with airpower in the new STRICOM, headquartered at MacDill Air Force Base, Fla.

At the Air Force Special Warfare Center at Eglin AFB, the accumulated experience of four decades of air operations is being applied to the job of developing airpower techniques for the very low rungs on the ladders of war's intensity. This is the AF-COIN program, or the Air Force part of the Nation's preparation for counterinsurgency struggles.

For this work, we are trying out beefed-up T-28's and B-26's with more power and more weapons—14 .50-caliber machineguns and a dozen external ordnance stations, for example, on a B-26 with a thousand more horsepower than the original.

Support techniques are keeping pace. We can snatch a 10,000-pound cargo package off a C-123 without touching down. We can get a C-130E fully loaded into a grass or clay runway of less than 1,000 feet. We are working on a system for snatching a cagelike capsule of 20 to 25 men off one of these planes without landing it. This technique will be a big help to the Army in getting over that first difficult period of concentration of men during an airborne operation.

For the general roles of air superiority and interdiction, our effective power will go up by an order of magnitude with the advent of the F-4C added to the F-105, with both then to be supplemented by the first fighter designed from scratch for dual-service use—the F-111, better known as the TFX.

While we are extending downward the effectiveness of our deterrent power, great changes are taking place at the level of the strategic deterrent. Missiles are coming into the inventory to provide a very special kind of delivery system for nuclear explosives.

The concept of strategic deterrence, of course, is a progression from the strategic bombing concepts of the 1930's. The B-47's and B-52's also progressions from those early bombers, will continue to carry the burden of strategic deterrence for some years. Current projections of the strategic forces, however, assume that a major part of the job can be done by missiles—land based or sea based—at a lower investment of men, money, and machines than would be possible with manned bombers of today's design.

In other words, the B-52 is passing the heavy explosive delivery part of its job on to the missiles. The Air Force believes that the effective life of the B-52 could be extended, in a joint role with missiles, through use of the Skybolt, but the return on the projected Skybolt investment was judged not worth the cost in the light of all the factors involved.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2461

an uneasy feeling that the administration is not telling all it safely could about Cuba, the unhappy spectacle of the U.S. Government bitterly fighting with the Cuban foes of Castro and, above all, the continued presence of Soviet troops with no apparent American plan for getting rid of them once and for all.

As former Vice President Nixon put it the other day, whether there are 12,000 or 17,000 Soviet troops in Cuba, Khrushchev's position "is firmer today than a year ago." Senator KEATING also says the precise number is somewhat beside the point; one Red soldier is too many. What matters is not Castro, who by himself would be just another pipsqueak dictator. Rather, the threat to all the Americas is Khrushchev in Cuba.

The New York Senator does, however, insist there has been practically no net reduction in the number since November, because the troops that have left have been replaced. Government officials retort in effect that it's easy to make such charges without documentation, and especially easy for political critics of the administration.

Unfortunately for that answer, the charges are coming from nonpolitical sources as well. For a notable example, from the New York Times' Ruby Hart Phillips, who spent 25 years in Cuba before being expelled by Castro in 1961 and who still remains in close touch as head of the Times' Miami bureau.

According to Mrs. Phillips' information, the Russian troops are being rotated, not taken out. Moreover, she declared flatly in a speech the other day that the missiles still remain in Cuba. "And I have not a doubt that they have a good submarine base and extensive submarine pens."

Such assertions, whether right or wrong, deserve more than an official brush-off. They could hardly be more serious; in Mrs. Phillips' view, unless Cuba is taken out of the Communist camp, all of Latin America is going to fall, country by country. Or, in Mr. Nixon's words, Khrushchev didn't spend a billion dollars merely for the purpose of acquiring Cuba; he has far bigger game in mind.

Nor do all those who are disturbed by administration policy take refuge in the "do something" generality. Mrs. Phillips is forthright enough; she says only force of arms will get communism out of Cuba. Many disagree, but it is a possibility that cannot be ruled out for all time.

Meantime Mr. KEATING, among others, advocates a number of further economic, diplomatic and military moves short of invasion. Certainly it does seem that, after facing up to Khrushchev last fall, it ought to be possible to demand the withdrawal of troops and weapons. It is hard to believe that it was necessary to lose October's initiative and move to the extreme of protecting Khrushchev's men from attacks by Cuban exiles.

Mr. Nixon may, perhaps, be charged with vagueness when he says the United States must make "a command decision to do whatever is necessary to force the removal of the Soviet beachhead." But his real point is that without such a decision, the problem can only get worse for us.

Will the risks of action, he asks, "be less in 6 months, 1 year, 2 years? If we allow Cuba to remain an example for Communist takeovers in other Latin American countries, the risks are certain to grow."

The issue is not, it seems to us, whether we should dispatch the Marines this minute. The deeply disquieting thing is the seeming absence of any real plan. Or if there has been any decision, for all the American people can tell, it is to accept an intolerable coexistence with Soviet conquest in our hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to emphasize the points made in this editorial: First, the administration is not telling all it safely could about Cuba.

Second, it is not Castro, it is Khrushchev, Khrushchev's position is firmer today in Cuba than it was a year ago. Third, there has been no significant decrease in Russian troops in Cuba. The Russian troops are being rotated, not taken out. Fourth, there is substantial evidence that missiles remain in Cuba and a good submarine base and submarine pens are in existence. Fifth, there is increasing evidence that other Latin American countries are in danger of being subverted by Khrushchev-Castro directed Communists. Sixth, and, in my opinion, most important, the seeming absence of any real plan by the Kennedy administration for freeing Cuba and getting the Russian aggressors out of this hemisphere.

The President, in his news conference today, complained that his critics have not come up with any concrete plan. A look at the RECORD any day of the week will disclose that many of us have been advocating a number of measures, short of military action, which can and must be taken. I would suggest as a starter that the United States recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile. Contrary to the President's disavowal of the importance of exile governments in today's press conference, we have only to point to the important role such governments played in rallying underground forces in occupied countries in World War II to remind him that once again he is wrong or does not understand history.

Another phase of a positive program which we could enact now is to support a massive propaganda effort to encourage the Cubans, within and without that country, to throw off their dictators. Support internal uprisings of the Cuban people and let them know that we will not fail them if they do accept our promise to support their efforts to win freedom. We should institute an effective blockade. From all available information it is apparent that if we were to cut off only the oil supplied to Cuba from Russia, the Castro government would be in immediate danger of collapse.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Cuba can be freed and the Russian menace to the United States and this hemisphere can be eliminated if the President will quit the doubletalk and replace his high-sounding words with deeds and action. We can again take the initiative in winning the war in which Communist Russia is engaging us if the President will face the issue with courage and will trust the American people with the facts. He can electrify all those who believe in freedom and can reinspire the Cuban people to renew their fight for liberty if he will immediately impose the Monroe Doctrine and in no uncertain terms notify Khrushchev that all Russian troops and all Russian equipment and all Russian subversion must be removed from this area without further delay.

The people are ready to back you up, Mr. President. Are you ready to lead the Nation?

Of course the distasteful truth is that no action that President Kennedy initiates will be successful, if the President does not understand the need and rea-

sons for it. The President disregards the dangers of Khrushchev controlling Cuba, the military buildup, the base for subversion of other nations; the submarines bases, and the continuing violation of the Monroe Doctrine and the sound reasons underlying this doctrine.

To be successful what is needed is a sound consistent, firmly stated worldwide foreign policy of toughness and self-interest, then a consistent hemispheric policy and then consistent actions directed to freeing Cuba. Isolated single shot actions like the quarantine are worse than any action without a continuing, consistent, tough understandable policy.

The Kennedy policy of indecision, vacillation, inconsistency, appeasement, and accommodation is no basis on which to launch any new Cuban action.

The President's inability to see a clear course of action does not mean that such actions are not possible or are not seen by others.

Whose Side Is Egypt On?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the American Examiner of March 21, 1963.

I am greatly disturbed by the continuing support and assistance this country is rendering to President Nasser and his grand designs to rule the Arab world; I know that many other Americans and many of our colleagues are also disturbed by this. Recent events in the Middle East as outlined in this article indicate that further trouble can be expected; the situation in Jordan during the past few days should make us stop and think about the possibility that this dictator may gain control over not only his own country but over Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia.

A more distressing fact is the absurd position we find ourselves in when Egypt—a nation we have provided or committed ourselves to provide over \$70 million in supporting assistance, development grants, and development loans in fiscal year 1963 alone—votes in the United Nations almost consistently against the United States and with the Soviet Union.

The American Examiner article follows:

SPOTLIGHT ON U.N.—NO ONE HAS KICKED THE UNITED STATES IN THE FACE MORE OFTEN THAN EGYPT, YET WE VALIANTLY CONTINUE TO SUPPORT NASSER

(By Saul Carson)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Keen observers here are watching the new developments in the Middle East with a good deal of concern. Colonel Nasser, the dictator of Egypt, has risen once again from the ashes under which, it seemed for a time, his ambitions for leadership of the Arab hegemony were buried.

Nasser has a knack for comeback. Remember 1956 when Israel licked him in the Sinai but France and Britain bowed to him and he came out victorious—with the help of the United States and its manipulation of votes at the United Nations—plus pressures on its major European allies? One recalls also that, although Nasser's desire for recognition as the leader of the Afro-Asian bloc drew a clunker, he had nevertheless set himself up as the most powerful of the Arab rulers, able to maintain his own regime's stability. Taking these, and other factors into account—one cannot dismiss too glibly the more recent developments.

First there was a revolution, Nasser inspired, in Yemen. Then came Iraq. Syria followed. Now Nasser is bringing pressures on Jordan and Saudi Arabia. There is talk of a possible move for unity, at least on the military plane, among five Arab States—Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Algeria, and the so-called republican forces of Yemen. Once such unity is established the first drive would probably be toward whipping Jordan and Saudi Arabia into line. Once Egypt gets its toe into Jordan—the entire issue becomes of immediate concern to Israel.

Israel circles here are, in fact, saying almost nothing for publication. The problem of possible increase of tensions in the Middle East is not merely an Israeli problem.

Some people here are worried not only about Nasser and the possible Arab unity toward an anti-Israeli crusade, but also about the manner in which the United States seems to be too willing to continue to support Nasser. The Egyptian dictator is still talked of by Americans as a plus factor in the war against communism. The fact that, in both Iraq and in Syria, there is a campaign on to wipe out domestic communism, is meaningless. The U.S.S.R. has never hesitated betraying its own domestic pals in any country for the sake of larger moves on the international level. Let an anti-Israel war break out—and Moscow would be the first to offer arms to the Arabs, even if they put every local Communist before a firing squad.

Diplomats here are aware of the weakness in Nasser's internal economy. Recently, Peter Wright, an economist, made a secret study of that economy for the World Bank. The Bank is a U.N. agency. Mr. Wright found severe strains in Nasser's economy. Nasser has been siphoning off too much money for the purchase of Soviet armaments and for the fomenting of revolutions in other Arab lands. Nasser has had to impose severe restrictions on his country's foreign currency allocations, he has had to slow down the work on the Aswan Dam, and he is having a tough time financing those sops he wanted to give his own people in the form of improved educational facilities and housing.

Yet Mr. Wright's visit was a preliminary move toward formation of a broad Western consortium which would give Nasser still greater funds—wherewith to purchase more Soviet arms and tighten his hold on other Arab lands.

Here at the United Nations, some of the keenest diplomats shake their heads at American gullibility when it comes to Nasser. No member here has kicked the United States of America in the face more often than Egypt. Analysts have shown that, in one session of the General Assembly (in 1960), Egypt voted almost consistently against the United States of America whenever there was an issue at dispute between Washington and Moscow.

On 73 different occasions, Egypt voted the Soviet way 53 times and for the American point of view only 4 times—abstaining 16 times.

These figures hold, in general, for other Assembly sessions—including the session in 1962. By such a count—whose friend is Nasser?

Yet the U.S. official policy is to support him. On the other hand, there is no doubt that the Kennedy administration has done much for Israel too. Of greatest importance was President Kennedy's decision (and it was a personal decision) to permit Israel to purchase Hawk missiles as a defense against Nasser's new rocketry.

No one here believes for a moment that the United States of America wants to sell Israel down the Nile. But people are incredulous at Washington's patience with Nasser.

Now that Nasser is moving toward a five-nation military bloc, which could lead toward a war against Israel, the puzzlement in regard to Washington's wisdom on the Nasser front increases in the halls of the United Nations.

How Can I Help Preserve American Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the 16th District of Ohio has the distinction this year of having produced two of the State's winners in the annual American Legion essay contest, and I am pleased to include the essays herewith in the RECORD.

The essays follow:

HOW CAN I HELP PRESERVE THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY?

(By Eric Blatz, 751 Rotch Avenue, Massillon, Ohio 10th Grade, Washington High School)

Democracy is government by the majority of people under a constitution which protects the rights of all the people. It is a way of life that looks easy but is difficult. It recognizes the inner dignity of all men. Democracy in the strictest sense is rule by the people.

I can help preserve democracy in the United States by being proud of my country and by showing this pride in my speech and deeds. If I must oppose my Government, I should do it in a peaceful manner. I must not tolerate a one-party system, because it becomes a rubber-stamp government. Some men in high office are advocating a one-party system, at present it looks harmless, but it can grow and destroy our balance of a true democracy. A two-party system serves as a check and balance.

The Constitution guarantees me freedom of religion. I may practice the religion of my choice, and as a good American, should be tolerant of religions other than my own.

My right to vote must be exercised for many nations are without this privilege. In the last midterm election 51 million American people exercised their right to vote, but 59 million people did not vote.

I must respect our judicial system. We must rule by majority but recognize the rights of minorities. If I serve as a jurist, I should think with an open mind and arrive at an honest opinion. I must obey the law of the land to the best of my ability. We must respect the opinions of others even though they are different from our own.

Mob rule is a form of anarchy and has no place in a democracy. I should take no part in riots, unruly mobs, or unlawful acts of violence against man or subversion against my country. I should go through due process of law to right a wrong.

I must be well informed on certain problems of my country. Survival and preservation of freedom are our problems today. Mr. Herbert Philbrick said, "Apathy, indifference, and complacency on the part of many Americans are the reasons for the tremendous Communist gains during the past 45 years." Ignorance of geography and inability to live up to national ideals have been a big weakness too. The greatest weakness of our culture is unwillingness of our people to work hard and the inappropriate use of leisure.

I should serve and help defend my country at all times. In order to serve my country I should be physically and mentally prepared. Our forefathers knew that fighting for and winning liberty was not the end, but only the beginning. Many sacrifices were made by our Founding Fathers and patriots who have given their lives many times to preserve our Nation from military attack. We must guard against the temptation to accept the philosophy of defeatism.

By being proud of my country, practicing the freedom of worship, exercising the right to vote, obeying the laws of my country, having no part in mob rule, being well informed on my country's problems, recognizing and upholding the rights of my fellow men, and helping to defend my country at all times, I can help preserve the American democracy.

HOW CAN I HELP PRESERVE THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY?

(By Thomas Burrier, Route No. 1, Newcomerstown, Ohio, ninth grade, Stone Creek High School)

Americans have a great heritage. We are proud of everything that has made the United States what it is today. We have a great democracy to save or to lose. We have heard President Kennedy's quote used many times: "Ask not what your country can do for you, rather, what you can do for your country." How can I as a student, help to keep the American democracy?

I can be a good student. Our country needs young people who are well trained in history, science, languages and literature. If we are good learners, it will help us to be good leaders.

I can be a good citizen at home and in the community. If we misbehave and do criminal things, we weaken our Nation. What we do today will shape what we will be tomorrow.

I can keep myself informed by reading newspapers, magazines, and books so I will keep alert to the world and to what is happening in it today. There are many troubled places in our world today. Cuba, the Congo, and Berlin, know no security nor peace. These governments in distant countries have an influence on us. If we know the ideas and beliefs of these people, we will understand their problems and will not make the same mistakes ourselves. A great philosopher once said, "A nation that does not know history is fated to repeat it."

I can learn now to accept responsibilities and do my share. Too many people shirk their responsibilities and say "let George do it." This is wrong; because unless each of us does his part, the Nation is much weaker.

I can attack race prejudices and other injustices whenever I see them. When we refuse to let people eat in restaurants or enter schools because their skin is a different color than ours, we are being unjust and justice is a great preservation of democracy.

I can learn to obey and to get along with others now so that later I will know how to cooperate and accept the suggestions and plans of others. To preserve our democracy, I must be willing to obey laws that are written as well as unwritten laws such as kindness and unselfishness.

I can be honest. The honesty we practice today will help us to be honest later in our lives. Dishonesty and cheating other

April 24

normal unemployment compensation given by the State. Monetary allowances depend on age and family status ranging from no compensation for those under a certain age and no head-of-family status, such as a recent high school graduate, to head-of-household pay of approximately \$33 per week while in training status.

A checking with the Missouri State Employment Service disclosed that in Missouri the Manpower Retraining Act is a going concern and that courses are offered in the clerical, service, medical occupational, farm, mechanical, construction, and production fields on a continuing statewide basis dictated primarily by needs of both people and places.

As an example, an auto mechanic course is slated to begin soon in Mexico with 15 students, with both travel allowance and pay granted in pertinent cases. A practical nursing course of 16 weeks is well past the planning stage here. A clerk-stenographer course of 48 weeks is scheduled to begin this summer. Aptitude tests are required of prospective students in every case.

Here is something new, but tried and proven in one short year of existence. For unemployed, or the underemployed person, this training can provide a new skill where needed or upgrade present skills to meet the job needs of workers displaced by automation, technological change, geographical change of industry, and shifts in market demands.

However, job openings in most cases, must be available or anticipated in an area before courses are established. The trainee must have reasonable expectation of employment in the immediate area or give assurance that he or she will accept employment elsewhere.

There is a need for more trained personnel in the practical nursing field and in the clerk-stenographer field here in Columbia.

Here is a program that portends a bright future, and is a good deal for the unemployed or the underemployed. For further information, job seekers should check with the Missouri State Employment Service, 804 Locust Street, which acts as the project office for the adjacent four-county area.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE E. MAHER, OF IOWA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, too often a State sees its outstanding residents pack up their bags and leave for what appear to be greener pastures elsewhere. But the tide can be stemmed when a young man demonstrates his willingness to contribute to the betterment of his community and State, thus setting an example for others not only to follow but to imitate in selling their State. Such a man is George E. Maher, of Red Oak, Iowa, recently named winner of the 1962 Iowa Junior Chamber of Commerce's Distinguished Service Award. His story is the reason why Iowa and other States are able to retain their young leaders. To list all of Mr. Maher's accomplishments would be no small job. But to cite only a few:

First, a member of a special church committee to raise several hundred thousand dollars for construction of a new church.

Second, chairman of a citizens' steering committee to push a successful million-dollar school bond issue.

Third, active in a drive for funds to enable Red Oak's Industrial Foundation to purchase an 80-acre tract of land to attract new industry. One firm already has located there.

Fourth, chairman of a committee to modernize the Red Oak Jaycee Community Development Survey, which resulted in water fluoridation, renovation, and painting of all street signs. As a result, his committee won first place in State competition.

Fifth, chairman of a committee urging turnout for the oral polio program. Some 15,000 persons, more than double Red Oak's population, participated.

Sixth, chairman of the Red Oak Jaycee committee for establishment of a youth center.

With all this time spent in civic activities, George Maher still has not neglected his wife, Pat; son, Mike; or daughters, Kim and Kristy.

He has been an inspiration and an example to those in his community and his State.

TENURE AND THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on March 11, 1963, Mr. L. C. Binford of Portland, Oreg., who is now the national president of the Izaak Walton League of America, made a very thought-provoking talk before the National Advisory Board Council of the Bureau of Land Management.

In his position as president of the Izaak Walton League, he outlined in extremely capable fashion the views held by many in the league. I believe that his speech deserves serious consideration by all who are interested in public land management, and therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENURE AND THE PUBLIC LANDS (Address by L. C. Binford)

It is a pleasure to join with you in counseling the Bureau of Land Management as to the public lands under their direction.

I want to thank you for having invited me, as national president of the Izaak Walton League of America, to present our views on the joint and multiple uses of the public lands and areas of understanding and misunderstanding of the users.

This meeting may become a new milestone in public land management. As a council, you have evolved from a body elected by the livestock user group plus wildlife representatives from each State, to a group that represents all users.

At your first meeting under the expanded membership held only last November at Las Vegas, Karl Landstrom, Director of Bureau of Land Management, reminded you that you reflect broader consideration than domestic livestock grazing alone, and that you must carefully identify the place of public land management in the natural resource program as a whole.

At Las Vegas, you were necessarily involved almost entirely in the question of grazing fees, which I hope is settled for now. By the nature of the subject you have asked me to discuss, I take it that this meeting will consider the broad aspects of public land management. If you do this it will truly be a milestone, and could mark the beginning of sound, comprehensive, multiple use management of Interior's 178 million acres of land. Maybe we should include Alaska and add another 273 million acres. say that we, too, have a trust to represent 186 million people, the folks who own the

public lands. We in the Izaak Walton League say that we, too, have a trust to represent the public's interest in U.S. held lands.

As an official elected by a group of conservationists, most of whom are hunters and fishermen, I am aware of the problem faced by the rest of you, especially you stockmen who are here by the election of your user group. No doubt you are to a large degree beholden to them as I am to my sportsmen electors. You wildlife members have a mixed loyalty—if one is due our electors. You got on an Advisory Board by selection of a State director, who probably picked you from the nominees submitted by the State fish and game department and then the State advisory board selected you for this national group.

The rest of you—representing county government, urban-suburban development, oil and gas, outdoor recreation, forestry and fish, conservation, petroleum, and soil conservation—were selected and appointed by the Secretary rather than by the interest you represent.

Within your Council every used interest is represented—at least if broad definition is given to such interests as outdoor recreation and conservation. Numerically you are still a livestock group.

Let me suggest that John A. Carver, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Interior, in his address to you at Las Vegas, used words which should become the preamble to all your deliberations.

"We are concerned not just with the economic benefits which flow directly, but we are also concerned with values which do not easily have an economic base attached to them; certainly some types of recreation value, certain types of outdoor experiences are included in this, and certainly the wildlife values have an importance above and beyond any economic price tag that you may put upon wildlife benefits.

"In larger sense, we are interested in the future. We are conservationists, all of us, whether you are a sheep or a cattle operator or whether you are a county official or whatever. We have an interest in the future. We want to leave the land in at least as good a shape and if possible in better shape than we found it when we came upon it. So we have that common objective in the correct management of the land."

If you follow this broad concept as your common objective, it will be a milestone in public management. If you do not do so, if you are only individuals each representing a special user interest, the public will eventually demand your abolition and the creation of a comprehensive advisory group.

Multiple use of public lands is not a concept created by some public official or department of Government.

Multiple use is a fact created by people. There are values on the public-owned lands people want to use. Primary push was for some economic advantage, such as trapping fur-bearing animals, even early day market hunting, logging, grazing, and mining. As the numbers of people increased, there came recreational hunting, fishing, berry-picking, fossil and rock hunting, camping, and innumerable varieties of outdoor use.

Just to cope with this multiple-use fact, governmental agencies put into management program these demanded uses. This multiple-use concept has long been the guiding principle of land management by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, its application being carried out to the extent of public demand.

In 1960 the Forest Service was given a congressional mandate to apply the principle of multiple use; and now the people's demand for multiple use on BLM lands is recognized in a bill before Congress.

After I prepared this introductory part of my speech, I was informed that my subject was limited to "Tenure and the Public

1963

strengthen the Nation. The program isn't identical to the earlier GI or Korean plans. There is no mustering out pay or business loans. Veterans must have had 180 days of active service. Six-month trainees under the reserve program are not eligible.

When I testified in support of similar legislation in 1961, I noted that in Alaska the number of veterans who would be entitled to educational and vocational training benefits under provisions of the bill would be approximately 600. The figure in 1963 is substantially the same. The assistance provided by the bill would enrich the contribution of each to Alaska and to the Nation. Certainly the post-Korea GI is as much in need of assistance in obtaining loans for the purchase of homes and farms as was his older comrade who served in a different time. Interruption of a man's career cannot be heeded one moment, and ignored the next.

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT made a valuable contribution to our heritage education when he fought for and successfully enacted legislation which we know today as the Fulbright scholarship program. Only last year, Senator FULBRIGHT in a speech on the Senate floor on March 22, said:

"Through education we strive to bring out the good in our young people and to cultivate in them a desire to preserve and protect the values of our society. A good education is basic to good citizenship."

Later in the same speech, he recalled the words of President James Madison who once said:

"Popular government without popular education is a prologue to a farce or tragedy."

Madison's words are pertinent as we discuss the need for this proposed legislation. We dare not set the U.S. stage for either farce or tragedy. We dare only to set our stage for our posterity. We do not have much time for scene changes, nor do we have many pieces of furniture with which to work. We need the new tools and equipment of S. 5.

In his state of the Union address to the Congress on January 11, 1962, President Kennedy discussed the importance of education. He said the quality of our education was equally important to our strength. Said the President:

"If this Nation is to grow in wisdom and strength, then every able high school graduate should have the opportunity to develop his talents. Yet nearly half lack either the funds or the facilities to attend college."

A few lines later the President referred to the remark of H. G. Wells that "civilization is a race between education and catastrophe." Added the President:

"It is up to you in this Congress to determine the winner of that race. I welcome his challenge and I accept it."

"Nearly 150 years ago another President suggested: 'If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.'"

The words are Thomas Jefferson's, a man who never stopped in his fight to improve men's minds, a man who after serving 8 years as our President continued his efforts of enlightenment by helping establish the University of Virginia in Charlottesville.

Americans, given the choice, will select enlightenment and freedom for these are inseparables in a democracy. The bill, S. 5, now under consideration offers simple equality. Nothing more.

And the bill offers assistance to young farmers and to men and women who would like to have homes of their own. Last year in its report on this measure, the committee said it expects that some 1 million post-Korean veterans would be able to purchase homes and farms under one title of the bill. The proposed language has been retained in this bill.

Conservative estimates place the possible construction of new homes at 700,000.

The simple extension of veterans' benefits of title 38, chapter 37 as proposed in new section 18 for "veterans who serve between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963," is important. It will provide a valuable economic incentive for many industries.

Seven hundred thousand new homes, be they in the city or on farms or in suburbia, will use vast quantities of lumber, bricks, glass, electrical wiring, plumbing, tile, paint, concrete, insulation, sewage facilities, shingles, etc.

The new jobs stimulated by this proposed legislation will mean a great deal to the unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the committee for this opportunity to endorse S. 5, and I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article by Dr. Sar A. Levitan, director of the area redevelopment project at George Washington University, Washington, D.C., entitled "Youth Unemployment—A Problem That's Getting Worse: What's To Be Done?" be placed in the hearing record at the close of my testimony.

Dr. Levitan describes the pressing need and demand "for skill, education, and technical know-how needed to man jobs in our complex technological civilization."

GROWING EVIDENCE OF A BIPARTISAN CONSENSUS ON CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reports that the United States is preparing to ask the OAS to declare an economic embargo against Cuba are very encouraging.

These follow the suggestion of the majority leader on a Sunday television interview that the United States participate with the OAS in an economic quarantine against Cuba similar to the one used successfully against the Dominican Republic in 1960.

It has been my view of some time that strong economic measures are the key to a successful policy toward Communist Cuba. The first steps of the program of graduated economic sanctions which I outlined in the position paper which I presented to Secretary Rusk and CIA Director McCone in February included the curtailment of flights and steamship routings between Cuba and other Latin American countries, a trade boycott between Cuba and other Latin American countries, and the denial of Latin American cargoes or refueling facilities to ships or planes trading with Cuba.

No one would realistically expect such measures alone to drive the Soviets out of Cuba. The United States embargo has not had this effect, and trade between Cuba and most other Latin American countries is already at a low point. The real lifeline to Communist Cuba runs from the Soviet Union, and any realistic long-range program must contemplate an economic squeeze on the Soviet Union as well as Castro. This will require, as I discussed in my February position paper and earlier this month on the Senate floor, action by NATO paralleling the steps we are now urging upon the OAS.

Nevertheless, I am heartened by the growing evidence that the United States is attempting to shape the economic advantages of the free world into a powerful weapon against communism. This is not an easy task, and it will require determination and sacrifice. I

am convinced, however, that a concerted program of this character can lead the Soviets to the conclusion that their Cuban venture was a costly and foolish mistake. Certainly this is a policy worth pursuing before more drastic measures are considered.

The majority leader has recognized the importance of constructive debate on Cuba and has never joined with those who treat every suggestion or criticism as an attack on our Government. In his remarks in the Senate last Thursday he made several references to my views on Cuba and voiced his own plea for "sound and good bipartisanship." All of us, I am sure, place our Nation's interests above those of any political party. I am certain that if this debate can be carried on in the tone and spirit exemplified by the majority leader's comments, it will help rather than hinder the development of an urgently needed bipartisan consensus on Cuba.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the retraining provisions of Public Law 87-415, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, have been remarkably successful during the first year they have operated.

As is more often than not the case with such Federal-State programs, the key to success lies in the level of local interest and support. In this regard, my State of Missouri is a good case in point. Industrial and civic leaders have joined with representatives of both local and State governments to launch in Missouri an aggressive program under the new law. The sure-fire formula that attacks both ends of the domestic employment problem by making it possible for the unemployed and underemployed to learn new skills and upgrade present skills to fill the critical occupational shortages that exist, is proving to be a great mutual benefit to workers and employer alike. Moreover, Missouri's program is serving to uplift and stabilize the local community and State economy.

In a recent thoughtful editorial, the Columbia Missourian lauded the program as "something new, but tried and proven," and traces the success it has been in my State. I believe all the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find this editorial interesting and edifying. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFF TO GOOD START

Seven out of every ten persons retrained through the Government Manpower Retraining Act of 1962 found work after completion of their courses.

Public Law 87-415 authorized the 3-year, \$435-million program for the training of unemployed persons in vocational skills or on-the-job training to develop new skills. The first 2 years the cost will be paid by the Federal Government while the third year the cost will be shared equally by the States.

The program offers up to 52 weeks of training with monetary allowances equal to the

all work together, with diligence and with integrity, to make an even greater Chicago.

I would like to express my appreciation to all of the media of communications, the metropolitan press, the community press, the radio, and TV stations, civic organizations, the clergy, labor organizations, all who have a part in shaping public sentiment, all who are truly concerned with promoting the physical, material, social, and spiritual welfare of the millions of people, of every race, creed, and color, who live and work and worship here in harmony.

Always we have to bear in mind that in Chicago, great among the greatest of industrial, commercial, and cultural centers of the world, the greatest resource of all is the people themselves. It is from the people that our proud spirit of "I will" springs. It is with the people that this spirit resides, spurring all of us to greater effort, impelling us to live up to the heritage we have from those who have gone before us.

There is no greater honor to me than to serve the people of Chicago as their mayor. This is the city of my birth, this is the city of my upbringing and all that I am I owe to my mother and father, to my good wife and family, to my teachers and to my good neighbors and friends.

The goal of the metropolis is to offer to its citizens the widest possible variety of choice in all aspects of living and working, providing the greatest variety in choice of jobs, and the maximum variety of educational and cultural opportunities.

It is the destiny of Chicago to be a great metropolis.

With your cooperation and with the cooperation of the people of Chicago, and with God's help, we shall not fail.

TIME FOR MANDATORY SEVERANCE OF AID TO NASSER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that our Nation is commemorating the 20th anniversary of the heroic but ill-fated uprising of the persecuted Jews in the Warsaw ghetto at the very time that a new totalitarian despot, Nasser of the United Arab Republic, is preparing new aggression to wipe out the State of Israel and to annex other territory.

If the observances of the Warsaw ghetto anniversary are to have any real meaning, it is essential that we prevent a repetition of the notorious atrocities of the Nazis. Former Nazis and other German technicians and scientists are now in Egypt aiding the United Arab Republic to perfect the missiles and weapons to destroy those Jews, now resident of Israel, who managed to escape Hitler's holocaust.

The United Arab Republic, in advocating "Arab socialism" is pursuing a policy reminiscent of the "national socialism" of Hitler's Germany. Instead of raising the living standards of the masses through reforms in education, health, housing, and peaceful production of necessary commodities, Nasser is concentrating on building a police state which is preparing for a space age war. Nasser is squandering his own assets to buy Soviet jet bombers and jet fighters as well as military rockets. The Arab peasant remains in the horse age but

Nasser dreams of a vast Arab empire ruled by his missile-equipped army, trained by Soviet and ex-Nazi military technicians.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot dictate the internal affairs of the United Arab Republic despite the threat to peace. Nasser has openly announced that his expanded Arab union will "liberate Palestine" through destruction of Israel. His agents and spies are plotting to overthrow pro-Western Jordan and Saudi Arabia. His treasury is paying out millions for Soviet equipment of even more recent design than that supplied Cuba. His shipping, incidentally, trades with Cuba while his press condemns the United States and condones Castro.

No, Mr. Speaker, we cannot dictate the internal affairs of the United Arab Republic even though the conscience of mankind has just been shocked by the employment of former Nazis to perfect missiles to sow mass destruction on Israel.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are things that we can do in the national interest of the United States. There is certainly no logic in the American taxpayer subsidizing, however indirectly, the U.A.R. military missile build up and further acquisition of a dangerous arsenal of Soviet weapons. I do not think that 1 cent should go to defray the Soviet weapons expenditures of a country like the U.A.R. which supports Communist Cuba.

A country which takes upon itself to jeopardize world peace by irresponsible and power-mad proliferation of the rocket race does not deserve our subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, I am preparing therefore legislation which I intend to propose to make mandatory the severance of American assistance to the United Arab Republic in view of its use of its own resources to finance sophisticated Soviet weapons systems, to train its officers and specialists in the Soviet bloc military centers, and to establish a Nazi-staffed missile center in the inflammable Near East.

There has been on the books the stipulation introduced last session by Senator KEATING and myself known by some as the Keating-Halpern amendment to favor, in dispensing our aid, those nations which do not divert their own resources to buy Soviet arms. Those implementing our aid program have ignored this expression of the sense of Congress. The time has come for more forceful action and I call on all my colleagues to join with me in writing language into this year's bill to end our misguided and disastrous subsidy of Mr. Nasser, the Fidel Castro of the Near East.

I would like in this connection to draw attention of the Congress to a pertinent syndicated news column by Milton Friedman, a White House correspondent, whose writings appear in many newspapers. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this point in my remarks to insert the Milton Friedman column:

MILTON FRIEDMAN COLUMN

WASHINGTON.—There are actions the administration could take to give deeper mean-

ing to President Kennedy's proclamation calling for observance on April 21 of the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising.

Mr. Kennedy noted that the Jewish martyrs lacked military resources but struggled against the overwhelming forces of the Nazi occupiers for more than 3 weeks, thereby providing a chapter in the annals of human heroism.

Today, the scene shifts to Israel. Nasser's goal; annihilation of Israel, is no different from that of SS-General Jurgen Stroop, commander of the Nazi forces assigned to liquidate the Warsaw ghetto.

The survivors of the Nazi holocaust and other Israelis have no desire to die in another fiery and doomed ghetto. They see Egypt being armed and trained by the Soviet Union. Egypt has received Russian offensive weapons more modern than those removed from Cuba at American insistence. Meanwhile, Egypt is developing a new Afrika Corps of West German scientists and technicians, including Nazis, to build missiles and super-sonic Messerschmitt jet fighters.

But the fact most difficult to live with is the indirect subsidization by the United States of the Egyptian military buildup. State Department officials still refuse to draw a moral distinction between democratic Israel and totalitarian Egypt and equate the two nations as equally worthy. There are hints that if Israel says too much about Egyptian missiles, some people here might start questioning Israel's development of new weapons.

President Kennedy last year met a situation which then existed. He authorized Israel to purchase Hawk antiaircraft missiles from the United States. Negotiations over purchase terms are just ending. The Hawks are yet to be delivered.

A gap now exists, to Israel's perilous disadvantage. An "escalation" of weapons system has occurred. Nasser no longer has to use bombers to blast Israel. He needs only to push buttons and dispatch salvos of missiles which are unstoppable by Hawks or anything else.

The Egyptian missile does not have to land on top of Tel Aviv's Dan Hotel, Allenby Road will do.

The Hawks will arrive this year to meet last year's situation. Israel once more lags behind.

Nasser has received hundreds of millions of dollars in American loans, grants, and other aid. He uses his own resources, thus freed, to build missiles and pay Nazis. Even funds generated by sale of American surplus food given to Egypt are used partially for military purposes.

The American taxpayer is thus made to help Egypt buy Soviet arms, pay Communists for instructing Egyptian personnel, and compensate Germans, including Nazis, now working in the Egyptian military establishment.

This issue will certainly be raised, by Democrats and Republicans alike, when the aid program comes before Congress this spring.

America is buying Nasser's favor by subsidizing the work in Cairo of former Nazi Storm Troop Col. Ferdinand Brandner who directs one of the new special weapons groups. America also finances, however indirectly, the German unit's medical officer, the notorious Dr. Elsele, who escaped to Egypt from Germany to avoid trial for atrocities he committed as camp doctor at Buchenwald concentration camp.

President Kennedy said the heroic uprising of Warsaw ghetto Jews was "an inspiration to the peace-loving people of the world and a warning to would-be oppressors which will long be remembered."

This proclamation was a kind and sincere statement by the President. But it would

achieve functional significance if American policy withheld aid from "would-be oppressors" and otherwise prevented Nasser from becoming another SS Gen. Jurgen Stroop.

A fitting commemoration of the Warsaw ghetto uprising could include a new look by Washington at Egypt, the nation which is arming to wipe out the survivors of Hitler's holocaust.

U.S. POLICY IN CUBA

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a tour of Naval Reserve duty to our naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, our Atlantic Command headquarters at Norfolk, and several other top military bases.

I have come back deeply impressed with the clear and convincing evidence I found that the situation in Cuba is well under control, that our forces are well trained, alert, their morale high, their weapons outstanding, and ready for anything that comes. I found the level of our military intelligence about Cuba still of the highest quality.

After such a visit one realizes that only the sheerest kind of demagog could still maintain that the United States has no Cuban policy.

Of course we have a policy, clear, simple, and precise. It is to proceed, in company with our Latin American allies, to isolate Castro as completely as possible, to keep his Cuba under complete and constant military surveillance, to apply a whole myriad of political and economic pressures to his regime, and to maintain immediately available and in full combat readiness an overwhelming military force capable of completely wiping out his regime in case the Cuban dictator should ever again threaten direct military operations anywhere in the Caribbean. And our basic objective is to remove Soviet troops from Cuba, to eliminate the Castro regime, and to establish a free and independent Cuba.

This is a policy which at the moment involves actions short of war. But it is a policy which also takes into account every possible contingency. No reasonable informed American would expect us to publish those contingency arrangements in the newspapers any more than he would have expected us to broadcast the time and place of the Normandy landings over the radio a week before D-day.

It is not Castro who has us boxed in down there—it is we who have Castro boxed in. And I for one would certainly hate to be in his shoes, and on his side of the Cactus Curtain right now.

We can best understand what is going on in Cuba, I think, by comparing Castro to a fugitive from the police, holed up in a farmhouse with the farmer's wife and youngsters as hostages, and with the police surrounding the house on all sides. The police can wait the fugitive out, they can go in shooting and run the risk of hurting the wife and children, or they can lob tear gas shells at him until the heat and irritation force him out with his hands up.

Nobody in his right mind would criti-

cize the police for momentarily resisting the temptation to shoot and trying the other alternatives first—nobody, that is, except someone who needed to keep his name in the headlines at any cost.

It has been something of a shock to me to come back and find that over the Easter week the same old people are at the same old stand, still peddling the same old campaign of fear, distortion, confusion, and pretense over Cuba. Obviously their information comes straight from the lecture platforms and the mimeograph machines because it is a cinch it does not come from the foxholes or the command plotting rooms of American fighting men.

As one who is proud to be a naval reservist, I resent these continuing efforts to portray our American military forces as either stupid or liars. If the Member of the other body who claims he knows all about all these Russian troops getting back into Cuba had taken the trouble to visit Cuba instead of trying to run American Cuban policy from the press gallery at the other end of the Capitol, he would never have dared to launch those preposterous charges of a new Cuban buildup. The plain fact of the matter is that shipping into Cuba today is vastly smaller than it was last summer.

So how are these new Russian troops supposed to get into Cuba anyway—by paddling rubber boats all the way down from the North Sea?

Some people, I suppose, will never be happy until we are fighting a full-scale war in the Caribbean. But I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of Americans understand and support our present Cuban policy. If new conditions arise, if new actions become necessary, they know that that decision can only be made by the President of the United States—just as he made it bravely and effectively last October. It assuredly cannot be made on the floor of the U.S. Senate and much less so in its press gallery.

Coming back from Cuba, I find myself a little bored with the antics of old men still desperately trying to stir up wars for young men to fight—all the time plausibly proclaiming both their opposition to invasion and of course their complete nonpartisanship.

"PACEM IN TERRIS"—POPE JOHN'S ENCYCLICAL ON THE DIGNITY OF MAN

(Mr. LINDSAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, when 4½ years ago John XXIII ascended the papal throne, people everywhere sensed, I think, that something remarkable had happened, that a new force for good had come into the world. Here, it seemed, was a man of extraordinary wisdom and humility—a man who, though old in years, was young in his zest for life and in his sympathy for modern humanitarian ideas. Men of good will welcomed Pope John's elevation in 1958. They have not been disappointed since.

With the publication of "Mater et Magistra" in July 1961, it became clear that Pope John's pontificate would mark a turning point, not merely in the history of the Catholic Church, but in the history of all mankind. And now we have "Pacem in Terris"—"Peace on Earth." It is a great and good document. I earnestly hope it will be read and pondered by Catholics and non-Catholics, by Christians and non-Christians.

The whole of "Pacem in Terris" has already been included in the Record. It is a wide-ranging document and almost all of it impressed me. But what particularly caught my attention were the Holy Father's references to fundamental human liberties. Perhaps never before has a great Christian leader shown so clearly how the rights of man can be deprived from the religious doctrine of natural law.

By the natural law every human being has the right to respect for his person, to his good reputation, the right to freedom in searching for truth and in expressing and communicating his opinions, and in pursuit of art, within the limits laid down by the moral order and the common good.

The Holy Father added:

And he has the right to be informed truthfully about public events.

The holy father lists other human rights.

From the dignity of the human person—

He says—

there also arises the right to carry on economic activities according to the degree of responsibility of which one is capable.

There is also a right to a working wage sufficient to give the worker and his family a standard of living in keeping with the dignity of the human person. In addition, the individual has a right to move freely within his own country and to be immune from all arbitrary attacks.

Human society—

The holy father states—

is realized in freedom, that is to say, in ways and means in keeping with the dignity of its citizens, who accept the responsibility of their actions, precisely because they are by nature rational beings.

I should like to draw attention to two other points, both of them stressed by his holiness. The first appears in the section of the encyclical headed "Duties." Pope John notes that both rights and duties stem from natural law. He continues:

Once this is admitted, it is also clear that in human society to one man's right there corresponds a duty in all other persons; namely, of acknowledging and respecting the right in question. For every fundamental human right draws its indestructible moral force from the natural law which, in granting it, imposes a corresponding obligation. Those, therefore, who claim their own rights, yet altogether forget or neglect to carry out their respective duties, are people who build with one hand and destroy with the other.

The lessons to be drawn from those sentences are many, but paramount among them is the absolute necessity of tolerance and restraint in our dealings with those who may differ from us.

The second point also appears under the heading of "Duties," where the holy

said. "That's inherently impossible because of the vast capacity of the human mind to learn and change society. But the issue really is, Are we doing all we should to provide the people for the kind of society we will have in the next decade?"

He and some others answer this question with a loud, impassioned "no." With notable exceptions, however, not many people seem concerned.

One who is concerned is Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, who told a House Education subcommittee last month that there is no future in America for the unskilled laborer.

Noting that the economy used to have a "shock absorber" mechanism permitting it to make use of millions of unskilled workers, Wirtz said machines are removing the shock absorber. The problem of older unskilled workers losing their jobs to machines will get worse between now and 1970, he said, as 26 million young people enter the labor market—"a far greater number than the country has ever had to educate, train and absorb into employment in any comparable length of time."

As Wirtz pointed out, the employment problem is twofold: technology is changing the job growth pattern, and the postwar baby boom is adding an unprecedented supply of manpower to the labor force this decade.

One difficulty is that no one knows exactly how many people will be needed in various vocations by 1970. Rough estimates by the Bureau of Labor Statistics are based on assumptions which are themselves uncertain.

It is assumed, for example, that there will be no major war, that business productivity will be high, that unemployment will be below the present 5.6 percent rate, that current labor force trends will continue without abrupt change, that college enrollment will double and "that the trend toward higher levels of education will not be stifled by lack of school facilities or staff or of needed aid to students."

With all these "ifs" in mind, the Bureau predicts that over this decade the labor force, about 67 million in 1960 and going up 21 percent to more than 80 million in 1970, will include:

A remarkable 43-percent increase in the number of professional and technical workers—from 7.5 million to 10.7 million, or 13.3 percent of the 1970 labor force.

A 34-percent increase in the number of service workers, such as nurses, waiters, cleaners, to total nearly 14 percent of the work force. Growth percentages in other categories are clerical, 31; sales, 23; managerial, 21; craftsmen and foremen, 20, and semiskilled, 13. The semiskilled will continue to be the largest group in the labor force—16.9 percent in 1970 compared with 18 percent in 1960.

A static number, 3.7 million, of unskilled industrial laborers, who will drop from 5.5 to 4.6 percent of the work force.

A 22-percent reduction in the farmworker population, dropping from 8 to 5.3 percent of the labor force.

Given the uncertain profile of the Nation's 1970 employment, the next question—one with an even more uncertain answer—is: How many trained people will American education (public, private, vocational, and general schools and apprenticeship programs) supply? A few examples will demonstrate the problems.

Labor Department studies show that during this decade 5.5 million new professional and technical workers may be needed to fill new jobs and replace those leaving others. However, only 3.7 million college graduates are expected to enter these fields by 1970.

Engineers required by 1970 could total 100 to provide the projected 1.4 million in this field. But unless more are taken, new engineering en-

trants will be only 450,000, including those transferring into engineering from other fields and those without degrees who are upgraded into the profession.

Scientists, who numbered 313,400 in 1960, should total 548,000 by 1970, according to a 1961 study. To meet the projected average annual demand for 25,000 new scientists to fill new jobs and to replace losses, 83,000 person with science degrees should be graduated each year. About 80,000 will be, but this near balance may not bridge a great gap between supply and demand in certain specialties.

Teachers required for elementary and secondary schools should number about 2.2 million, and nearly 2.1 million (newly graduated and those reentering the field) will be supplied. The deficit over the decade will be 84,000.

About 225,000 new electricians will be needed to meet growth and replacement requirements by 1970. Apprenticeship programs will supply only 31 percent, or 70,000.

For tool and the die makers, 85,000 will be required to meet growth and replacement demands, and apprenticeship programs will supply 45 percent, or 38,000.

These projections take into consideration the fact that nearly 70 percent of American young people were high school graduates last year and that more than 72 percent will be by 1970. Now about 18 percent are completing college, and 20 percent will do so by the end of the decade.

What happens when education does not supply the manpower demand is simply that people without all the qualifications get the jobs. Teachers are hired on a "temporary basis; nondegree holders become engineers; electricians learn their trade on the job."

"The saving thing is that people are adaptable, and industry is willing to be flexible," says Assistant Commissioner Harold Goldstein of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

But, as he noted in a recent speech, "the implications are clear that the general educational level of the work force will have to increase and (that) there will be fewer jobs open to people without at least a high school education."

Goldstein sees a danger in the possibility that with one of four boys getting college degrees, "we may starve our skilled trades of the bright people they need" since most college men avoid this field.

Growing attacks have been directed at vocational training programs in public schools, and recently 81 percent of the school administrators responding to a survey by the Nation's Schools magazine said such programs must be improved and updated. Most criticism centers on the emphasis on agriculture in many programs and on their failure to keep pace with the country's technological development.

Ward Beard, consultant in the Vocational Division of the U.S. Office of Education, says additional funds can solve most of these problems.

Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel says that "we'll be shooting ahead of the 1970 employment target" if Congress passes the administration's proposed reform of vocational education, aid for technical institutes, and plans for improving the quality of education. "Vocational programs should stress the kind of knowledge that has the widest application—math, science and language," he added. Keppel also advocates more retraining for people on the job or those who must change jobs.

Other serious problems which the Nation is just beginning to attack are school dropouts (about one-third of the young people entering the work force lack a high school education) and job discrimination against Negroes.

The problems of both groups, who often are the same people, overlap—both lack the training for any but the most menial jobs.

Most educated Negroes face additional difficulties of either inferior quality of schooling in segregated institutions or rebuffs in many trades and white-collar jobs despite their good education.

When the Nation's educational mechanism cannot keep up with employment demands, obviously the economy does not fail. But as Goldstein observed, "There will be more stresses, more pressures. We should be thankful that the adaptability of our people can alleviate the pressure. But then we cannot continue indefinitely to count on it."

Cuba PRESIDENT FAILS TO UNDERSTAND PEOPLE

(Mr. ALGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President's failure to understand people is at the root of the present trouble both at home and abroad. This is apparent as applied to the Cuban exiles who are seeking to free their homeland and is also why this Nation is moving ever closer to dictatorship.

President Kennedy shows no understanding of what motivates freedom-loving people. He does not trust them. In aggrandizement of his own role he substitutes his judgment and his solutions for the will of the people in the apparent belief that only he can be right.

Lacking human understanding, the Kennedy administration has come dangerously close to taking the heart out of the Cuban people. In his beautifully phrased speeches he promised them a brighter tomorrow in which their native land would be free; then he dashed their hopes and shattered their dreams by adopting a policy of protecting their oppressor and turning the might of this great Nation against those seeking freedom.

This same failure to understand the yearning and determination of the Cuban people to rid themselves of their Communist masters, has been in evidence in the domestic policies of the Kennedy administration. The President does not believe in the wisdom and the judgment of the people of his own country. He does not trust them to solve their own problems, to determine the course of their own lives, but insists that only through bureaucratic planning can free Americans achieve happiness. He does not understand that a people controlled by a dictatorship cannot be free and without freedom there can be no happiness.

The Kennedy failure to solve the Cuban problem emphasizes again that the administration is not telling all it safely could about Cuba. He ignores the fact that Khrushchev's position in Cuba is firmer than it was a year ago. He insists that Russian troops are being removed from Cuba while there is ample evidence to indicate they are merely being rotated. He ignores the threat of a Communist, Russian-dominated Cuba to the rest of Latin America. He refuses to use the means available to him, short of military action, to help free Cuba. In short, the President seems to lack any real plan to bring about the overthrow of communism in this hemisphere, and failing to have a plan is misleading both the Cuban freedom fighters and the

FRANCIS KEPPEL, COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, a fine portrait of a splendid Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, has been drawn by George Oakes in an article published in the April 14, 1963, edition of the Sunday Star. Commissioner Keppel has impressed many members of Congress with his knowledge, his grasp of the complex education field, his charm, his vision, and his direction. We wish him well in his task.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Record an article that gives a glimpse of the major problems confronting public officials and educators alike as they grapple to bring our education system into harmony with the revolutionary, explosive trends in our economic system.

FRANCIS KEPPEL, COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

The appointment of Francis Keppel as Commissioner of Education is probably the most important action taken so far by the Kennedy administration to advance its program for Federal aid to education.

The former dean of Harvard's graduate school of education is a professional whose entire career has been devoted to education at the highest academic level. He was born in the world of education for his father, the late Frederick P. Keppel, was dean of Columbia College and later president of the Carnegie Corp., one of the largest foundations dedicated to the improvement of American and international education.

Francis Keppel is noted for a keen, incisive mind, and the ability to express forcefully his ideas. A graduate of Groton and Harvard, he is 47, a dark-haired, slight man with a brisk manner.

Although he has only been grappling with his job as Education Commissioner since last December (he was confirmed by the Senate a little more than a month ago), he has had time to formulate some of his ideas on national education problems generally.

TIED TO NATIONAL STRENGTH

He is deeply convinced for example, that improvement of our entire educational system is central to the Nation's strength and status in the modern world. He believes that the American people must be made to understand that whatever this country can do to relieve unemployment, to retrain manpower, to accelerate the economy, to carry out our defense and space programs basically depends on the urgent expansion and upgrading of our education from elementary school through university graduate training. Once the public appreciates the relationship between improving the education of our youth and these national programs, which have widespread popular backing, then rapid progress will be made on the educational front. As he said on March 8 at the University of North Carolina: "A growing body of evidence indicates that the development of human capital—particularly investment in education—has actually been more important as a source of economic growth than has the accumulation of physical capital. Education contributes directly to economic growth because it improves the equality of the labor force * * *. As I see the situation, national security and economic growth now change the need for a Federal program in education from a desirable domestic goal to a deadly serious necessity."

SPECIALIZES IN COOPERATION

In tackling the task of trying to bring together the views of educators and educational organizations whose rivalry was partially responsible for the defeat of higher education legislation in Congress last year, Dr. Keppel has the advantage of commanding their confidence. He has already made a beginning in developing greater cooperation between the American Council on Education, the largest organization representing higher education, and the National Education Association, the major spokesman for elementary and secondary schools. A believer that successful operation results when a consensus has been achieved, Dr. Keppel has been moving vigorously to bring this about among various educational organizations and groups. He has pointed out that educators cannot pass education legislation, but by their action or inaction they can keep it from passing.

Dr. Keppel is convinced that the key element in raising the level of education is expanding the number and especially improving the caliber of our teachers both in school and college. The most significant factor in the learning process, next to the aptitude of the learner, is the quality of instruction.

This job of raising standards must start in the home. Parents must think that learning is important and show it when dealing with their children.

The Commissioner believes that the Federal Government must help increase very low starting salaries in many States to attract better schoolteachers and also to raise the top salaries, as he has proposed in the new education bill. Too often a 21-year-old man can reach the top salary after 15 years. If we are going to retain good teachers, there must be a satisfactory goal to work for. This would encourage more male schoolteachers to enter and stay in the profession and this Dr. Keppel feels is important, for he thinks that there is too large a proportion of women teaching in our public schools.

The tremendous expansion of college students between now and 1970, when college enrollments are expected to double is going to require a substantial number of new teachers, especially in science.

Starting from the premise that reforms in education "require training of people," Dr. Keppel is pleased Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover keeps stirring up a critical point of view toward our educational deficiencies but he believes a national examining standard must be considered flexibly. For example, it would be hard to give the same examination in schools located in wealthy suburban areas as in those in city slums. There is also the danger that a single examining standard might stultify the independence of the teaching staff. Dr. Keppel thinks that new curriculums and educational research projects will be important instruments in raising standards.

Pointing out that the role of the Federal Government in education "has been evident since before the adoption of the Constitution" and citing such landmarks as the Land Grant College Act, the GI bills of World War II and the Korean war and the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Dr. Keppel stresses that "Federal participation should continue to be selective, stimulative and, where possible, transitional." He favors the Federal Government working through and strengthening the State departments of education in quality and independence.

SEES A LIAISON TASK

Dr. Keppel is not pushing for the creation of a Department of Education as was proposed last year by Secretary Ribicoff. Rather he sees the role of the Office of Education

in the Federal structure as a "convener" or "liaison point" but not a director of the 40 Government departments and agencies that operate different educational programs in schools and colleges. As Commissioner of Education, it is believed that the President, who occasionally telephones Dr. Keppel directly, regards him as his primary adviser on education matters. Dr. Keppel expects to keep his eye on the overall effects of government on education and, if possible, help to settle any obvious conflicts on educational policy among the departments and agencies.

Dr. Keppel plans to improve the Office of Education by upgrading the key positions and attracting more well-qualified personnel. However, some claim that his own status was not enhanced by the recent establishment of two additional new Commissioners of Welfare and Vocational Rehabilitation in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Nevertheless, Secretary Celibrezze is reportedly letting Dr. Keppel run his own office without interference.

SEEKS TO PERSUADE STAFFERS

As the principal administration advocate for the primary school to graduate college education bill, Dr. Keppel began his campaign of persuasion with the strong personal indorsement of such influential figures as Senator Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, and Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, chairman of the House subcommittee handling major elements of the bill. He has been active on the Hill, talking to Congressmen who both favor and look with skepticism on the administration's program. Unlike many Government administrators, he has taken pains to seek out influential staff aids on both sides of the Capitol who play a vital role in advising their congressional bosses.

Although Dr. Keppel contributed to the education bill and indorses it, many of its features and particularly the omnibus approach were determined before his arrival.

The real question on the education bill is whether the administration, highly sensitive to the religious issue it always stirs up, will give Dr. Keppel the support he needs for major education legislation before the 1964 presidential election or whether they will use him to prepare the ground for a possible push during a second Kennedy term.

EDUCATION NOT MEETING JOB NEEDS

(By Susanna McBee)

American education is failing to pass one of its most important tests: training enough people to meet the Nation's future employment needs.

Education never has achieved the goal of placing the most qualified people in the right jobs—right for them and for the country—and it probably never will.

The fault lies not just with the educational system but with the facts of life in a free society. Some men get engineering degrees and become high-salaried business administrators; some women prepare to teach and get married instead.

Thirty years ago it was not so important to be trained specifically for certain jobs; today it is.

With what educators call the "knowledge explosion" (the world's store of knowledge is doubling every 10 or 15 years), there is an increasing need for more people to perform more tasks produced by more new knowledge.

"This has become such a big problem that it isn't really being faced," says one of American education's strongest critics, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, father of the nuclear submarine.

"No country has ever had an educational system adequate to its needs," Rickover

American people through management of the news and by withholding information.

I would like to inquire once again of the President, What is your plan to enforce the Monroe Doctrine and protect this hemisphere from foreign aggression? What is the Kennedy master strategy for the United States? As the head of a Nation that is still free, the people have a right to know where you intend to lead us and what form of government you and your advisers have in mind for the United States.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 24— STATE OF OREGON ON EL PASO NATURAL GAS CO. PETITION

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mr. GREEN] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] and myself, I wish to place in the Record a certified copy of House Joint Memorial 24, adopted by the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, now in session. This memorial relates to a petition of the El Paso Natural Gas Co. for authority to construct a gas line from Eugene, Ore., to Grants Pass, Ore. I am pleased to bring this matter to the attention of the House.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 24

To the Honorable CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Federal Power Commission has under advisement the petition of the El Paso Natural Gas Co. for authority to construct a gas line from Eugene, Ore., to Grants Pass, Ore., being petition No. CP 62-265; and

Whereas the plans and proposals of many persons and organizations in Oregon and elsewhere are dependent upon the granting or denial of such petition by the Federal Power Commission; and

Whereas the season for construction of major facilities of various kinds in the State of Oregon is rapidly approaching; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Federal Power Commission is urged to expedite its determination of petition No. CP 62-265 and render a prompt decision thereon.

2. The Secretary of State shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to each Member of the Oregon congressional delegation, and to the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. Adopted by house March 26, 1963.

CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate April 9, 1963.
BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY— LAW DAY U.S.A.

(Mr. MACGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the United States and the Communist world celebrate May Day in sharply contrasting ways. The Reds will flaunt their military might. In quieter, less spectacular fashion, we will pay tribute to the law—for May Day is Law Day in America.

The basic differences between the rule of men in Communist lands and the rule of law in the free world are summed up in one phrase: individual liberty, and its handmaiden, law. Liberty without law is license, and law without liberty is tyranny. America's objective is the advance of peace and individual freedom throughout the world under the rule of law. Communism seeks to smother freedom under an oppressive rule of men.

A full flowering of human endeavor is possible only when the individual is free to think for himself, to follow his own bent, and to enjoy the fruits of his own efforts. Men can do this only when they live in a free society in which individual rights are protected and basic obligations fixed by law.

It is literally true that law is the alternative to chaos on the one hand, and to terror on the other. No system of government know to man is free from errors of judgment in the lawmaking process, or in the executing of its laws. There is need for constant vigilance against the enactment of unwise laws and for the modification of other laws that do not serve the general welfare.

It is true that no system of government is slower to change its course than a democratic society such as our own. In our Republic, lawmaking is usually a slow, thoughtful process. Representatives of the people must give individual citizens an opportunity to participate in that process by contributing their ideas and opinions. This format has produced the best system of government yet known to man.

We must never forget that we are an orderly people under the rule of law, and that if we don't like a law we nevertheless obey it while we work to change it.

May we never listen to those who say that our present form of constitutional government is outmoded in this advanced scientific age. Our Constitution and bill of rights are flexible documents which allow room for change within the guidelines of individual liberty.

As Somerset Maugham so aptly put it:

If a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose its freedom; and the irony of it is that if it is comfort or money that it values more, it will lose that too.

It is my pleasure to join with the Minnesota State Bar Association, the American Bar Association, the news media, and other civic, patriotic, and educational groups by urging Americans everywhere to participate in this, the sixth annual Law Day observance in America.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14B OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

(Mr. SICKLES (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, under section 14B of the National Labor Relations Act, State law is permitted to diminish a right recognized under Federal law. This section provides that if States enact legislation concerning union security that is more restrictive than the Federal law, which allows a union shop, the State law prevails. This provision permits a State to override and nullify the intent of Federal labor-management policy. The "right-to-work" laws enacted at the State level outlaw the union shop—an arrangement that is both permitted and regulated by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Today I am introducing legislation to repeal section 14B of the National Labor Relations Act, by which States are empowered to enact the so-called "right-to-work" laws. This grant of power to the States abridges the right of free collective bargaining. It is neither equitable nor conducive to peaceful and enlightened labor-management relations.

Section 14B of the Taft-Hartley Act now permits any State to outlaw collective-bargaining agreements which are otherwise permissible under Federal law. Sixty percent of the States, including my own State of Maryland, do not infringe on the rights of employers and unions to include a union shop clause in their freely bargained contracts. In these States without "right-to-work" laws, a contract can be negotiated which requires an employee, after he has been hired, to join the union where he works or pay to the union an initiation fee and an amount equal to monthly dues. This is the maximum union security permitted under Federal law. In addition to permitting union shop, the Taft-Hartley Act also contains several safeguards to prevent abuse of the union shop. Of course, no contract is legal which requires union membership as a condition for getting the job in the first place.

At the present time, restrictive right-to-work laws exist primarily in non-industrial States. Indiana is the only industrial State to enact such a law. Maryland has considered passage of this restrictive legislation but wisely rejected it, as have other States with maximum experience in labor-management relations.

The practical effect of the so-called right-to-work laws is to pit State against State in a ruthless battle to lure industry by virtue of restrictive State legislation.

For the most part, States which have adopted regressive laws to attract industry have done their citizens no favor. An employer with so little civic responsibility that he will abandon a community on the hope of paying lower wages and no taxes elsewhere is a questionable asset to the community to which he moves. When the "gifts" run out in this new area, so does the employer.

The term right-to-work itself is a misnomer. These laws do not give any person the right to work. These laws

give him the right to enjoy the benefits of union negotiated contracts without "paying the freight" so to speak. It is not only fair, but the very essence of responsible democratic self-government in this country, that one who derives the benefit of a union negotiated contract, should be obliged to help pay his share of the cost of such services. It has been my experience that the absence of a provision for sharing the costs of union representation frequently leads to unstable labor-management relations. Thus, in reality, right-to-work laws undermine union security and with it responsible collective bargaining.

The workers themselves have overwhelmingly shown that they favor union security agreements in a collective bargaining contract. When the Taft-Hartley law was first passed in 1947, there was a section which provided that, after the union and the employer negotiated a union shop contract, that clause had to be ratified by a secret ballot vote of the affected employees. The results of these elections were so overwhelmingly in favor of the union security clauses that Senator Taft moved to discontinue these votes. In more than 97 percent of the elections, the union shop was ratified and 91 percent of the employees voted for a union shop. Moreover, the employees under a union shop agreement have the right to secure a secret ballot vote to rescind the provision. The use of this procedure has been negligible.

History has shown that the overwhelming number of workers want these union shop clauses. Where an employer and the union want to incorporate such a provision in a contract, it is unfair for a State to restrict this right. If the workers favor union security clauses, who then advocates right-to-work laws? These laws are of course advocated by those who have shown little real concern regarding the rights of workers. If the right-to-work advocates were really sincere about insuring occupational choice, they could properly concern themselves with fair employment practices legislation instead of using noble thoughts about freedom to cripple legitimate collective bargaining activities.

The 1960 Democratic platform adopted in Los Angeles states "we will repeal the authorization for right-to-work laws." Enactment of my bill would make this pledge a reality. "Right-to-work" laws are opposed by many religious groups on the grounds that such laws are an unnecessary restriction on free collective bargaining. These include the general board of the National Council of Churches, the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., the Board of Social and Economic Relations of the Methodist Church, the Rabbinical Council of America, and the Catholic Committee of the South.

Enlightened members of the business community have also favored repeal of the authorization to the States to enact right-to-work laws because they realize that the mischief and divisiveness caused by this legislation is a heavy price to pay for legislation that is largely irrelevant to the great labor-management issues of our day.

In conclusion, I see no reason why any State should be permitted to exercise undue interference with the rights of negotiating parties in collective bargaining. Union membership as a basis for continued employment should be left to agreement by labor and management through collective bargaining. Reason, justice, and experience point to the need for repeal of the existing pernicious authorization to the States which enables them to infringe on the collective bargaining process.

FAIR HOUSING ACT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 5843, which is designed to prohibit discrimination by reason of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin against persons seeking or utilizing housing in the District of Columbia. This bill is in the form as recommended by the Corporation Counsel of the District, acting pursuant to instructions of the chairman of Subcommittee No. 6 of the House District Committee.

Although I am convinced that the Commissioners have the authority under existing law to issue appropriate regulations accomplishing this purpose, I have, nevertheless, introduced this bill so that the District Committee and the Congress will have full opportunity to examine the issues and so that all interested parties can be heard.

PERMITTING NATIONAL BANKS TO UNDERWRITE AND DEAL IN SECURITIES ISSUED BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

(Mr. ST GERMAIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the body of the Record at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to aid States and municipalities by permitting national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments.

Since 1933 commercial banks have been prohibited from all underwriting and trading in securities. An exception was made in the case of general obligations of States and municipalities, obligations of the United States and certain other issues. The purpose of the legislation which enacted this prohibition was to take commercial banks out of speculative development projects and out of the corporate and foreign bond business. At that time, the volume of bonds payable solely from the revenues of a specific project was relatively small and tended to be concentrated on new development projects. Therefore, with some exceptions, revenue bonds were considered greater risk investments than general obligation bonds.

For many reasons there has been a shift in municipal financing. More and

more, new types of revenue bonds are being used in place of general obligations. However, these new types are quite different from the old high risk revenue bonds. They have an excellent record and are fundamentally general obligations in different form. They have been used to build schools, highways, bridges, water and electric plants. This type of revenue bond financing has greatly increased in recent years.

This bill will permit banks to underwrite, trade and deal in revenue bonds only to the extent national banks can invest in such bonds under the National Banking Act. Any bank can only own or be obligated to buy an amount of bonds limited to 10 percent of the bank's capital and surplus. Therefore the risk level is not raised.

Revenue bond financing from which commercial banks are now automatically excluded runs about one-third of the total market. State and local governments need the broadest possible markets for their growing volume of securities. The broader the market the greater the competition and the lower the interest rate. If commercial banks were permitted to participate in revenue bond financing the interest rate that the municipalities and States must pay would be lower. Therefore more public improvements which are financed in this way would be possible.

THE NIAGARA FRONTIER IN WESTERN NEW YORK STATE

(Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the body of the Record at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 19, 1963, the Niagara frontier in western New York State was honored by a very impressive ceremony—the New York Army National Guard assumed operational responsibility for the first Nike-Hercules air defense sites in the State of New York.

It was my pleasure to witness this eventful occasion and under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am happy to include the program.

Music by the 27th Armored Division Band, New York Army National Guard, which was followed by the rendition of honors. The invocation was given by a National Guard officer and the change of command ceremony followed. Lt. Ronald J. McQuaid, U.S. Army, was relieved by Capt. Robert H. Dupont, New York Army National Guard; Lt. William R. Pooley, U.S. Army, was relieved by Capt. Henry E. Close, New York Army National Guard.

Col. Thomas A. Rodgers, commanding officer, 31st Artillery Brigade—Air Defense—made the opening remarks which follow:

Distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a pleasure and a privilege to welcome you to the Lancaster Missile Site. The symbolic ceremony that you have just witnessed marks the transfer of manning responsibility for two Nike-Hercules sites to the New York Army National Guard. This unit, the 2d Missile Battalion, 209th Artillery, has a proud record of service in the Nike-Ajax program. It is only proper that it is